

CAMBRIDGE
CRITICAL
GUIDES

KANT'S

Lectures on Anthropology

A Critical Guide

Edited by
Alix Cohen

KANT'S *LECTURES ON ANTHROPOLOGY*

Kant's lectures on anthropology, which formed the basis of his *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* (1798), contain many observations on human nature, culture and psychology, and illuminate his distinctive approach to the human sciences. The essays in the present volume, written by an international team of leading Kant scholars, offer the first comprehensive scholarly assessment of these lectures, their philosophical importance, their evolution and their relation to Kant's critical philosophy. They explore a wide range of topics, including Kant's account of cognition, the senses, self-knowledge, freedom, passion, desire, morality, culture, education and cosmopolitanism. The volume will enrich current debates within Kantian scholarship as well as beyond, and will be of great interest to upper-level students and scholars of Kant, the history of anthropology, the philosophy of psychology and the social sciences.

ALIX COHEN is Chancellor's Fellow at the University of Edinburgh. She is the author of *Kant and the Human Sciences: Biology, Anthropology and History* (2009), and has published articles in journals including *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, *Kantian Review*, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* and *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*.

KANT'S
Lectures on Anthropology

A Critical Guide

EDITED BY
ALIX COHEN

University of Edinburgh



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107024915

© Cambridge University Press 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2014

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-107-02491-5 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of tables</i>	<i>page</i> vii
<i>List of contributors</i>	viii
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>List of translations and abbreviations</i>	xiii
 Introduction	 I
ALIX COHEN	
1 Kant's lectures on anthropology: some orienting remarks	10
WERNER STARK	
2 Self-cognition and self-assessment	18
RUDOLF A. MAKKEEL	
3 Kant on the phenomenology of touch and vision	38
GARY HATFIELD	
4 Meat on the bones: Kant's account of cognition in the anthropology lectures	57
TIM JANKOWIAK AND ERIC WATKINS	
5 The anthropology of cognition and its pragmatic implications	76
ALIX COHEN	
6 Affects and passions	94
PATRICK R. FRIERSON	
7 The inclination toward freedom	114
PAUL GUYER	
8 Empirical desire	133
ALLEN W. WOOD	

9	Kant as “vitalist”: the “principium of life” in <i>Anthropologie Friedländer</i> SUSAN MELD SHELL	151
10	Indispensable education of the being of reason and speech G. FELICITAS MUNZEL	172
11	Kant on civilisation, culture and moralisation CATHERINE WILSON	191
12	Cosmopolitical unity: the final destiny of the human species ROBERT B. LOUDEN	211
13	What a young man needs for his venture into the world: the function and evolution of the “Characteristics” JOHN H. ZAMMITO	230
	<i>Bibliography</i>	249
	<i>Index</i>	265

Tables

5.1 Varieties of understanding	<i>page</i> 77
5.2 Human types and nature's purposes	79
5.3 Cognitive disparities between temperaments	82
5.4 Cognitive disparities between nations	82
5.5 Cognitive variations between genders	82
9.1 Arrangement of Faculties in <i>Anthropologie Friedländer</i>	165

List of contributors

ALIX COHEN is Chancellor's Fellow at the University of Edinburgh. She is the author of *Kant and the Human Sciences: Biology, Anthropology and History* (2009), and editor of *Kant on Emotion and Value* (2014). She is also Associate Editor of the *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* and the Oxford Bibliography Online.

PATRICK R. FRIERSON is Associate Professor of Philosophy and Garrett Fellow in the Humanities at Whitman College in Walla Walla, Washington. He is the author of *Freedom and Anthropology in Kant's Moral Philosophy* (2003), *Kant's Questions: What Is the Human Being?* (2013), and *Kant's Empirical Psychology* (2014), and co-editor of *Kant: Observations on the Beautiful and the Sublime and Other Writings* (2011).

PAUL GUYER is the Jonathan Nelson Professor of Humanities and Philosophy at Brown University, and Florence R. C. Murray Professor Emeritus at the University of Pennsylvania. He is the author of nine books and editor of five anthologies on the philosophy of Kant, general co-editor of the Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant, and an editor and translator of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, and *Notes and Fragments* within that series as well as of Kant's *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime and Other Writings* in the Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. He is the author most recently of *A History of Modern Aesthetics* in three volumes (2014).

GARY HATFIELD is Adam Seybert Professor in Moral and Intellectual Philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. He has written on the history of modern philosophy and the history and philosophy of psychology from medieval times to the present, including *The Natural and the Normative: Theories of Spatial Perception from Kant to Helmholtz* (1990), *Descartes and the Meditations* (2003), and *Perception and Cognition: Essays in the Philosophy of Psychology* (2009).

TIM JANKOWIAK received his PhD from the University of California, San Diego, in 2012. He is currently an assistant professor of philosophy at Towson University. His research focuses primarily on Kant's theory of empirical cognition, especially Kant's theories of sensation and of the intentionality of sensory consciousness.

ROBERT B. LOUDEN is Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the University of Southern Maine. His publications include *Kant's Human Being* (2011), *The World We Want* (2007), *Kant's Impure Ethics* (2000), and *Morality and Moral Theory* (1992). Loudon is also co-editor and translator of two volumes in the Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant.

RUDOLF A. MAKKREEL is Charles Howard Candler Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at Emory University and author of *Dilthey, Philosopher of the Human Studies* (1975), *Imagination and Interpretation in Kant: The Hermeneutical Import of the "Critique of Judgment"* (1990), and *Orientation and Judgment in Hermeneutics* (2015). He edited the *Journal of the History of Philosophy* from 1983 to 1998. Makkreel is the co-editor of Dilthey's *Selected Works* (five volumes so far), of *Neo-Kantianism in Contemporary Philosophy* (2010) and of *Recent Contributions to Dilthey's Philosophy of the Human Sciences* (2011).

G. FELICITAS MUNZEL is Professor in the Program of Liberal Studies and Department of Philosophy at the University of Notre Dame. She is the author of *Kant's Conception of Moral Character: The "Critical" Link of Morality, Anthropology, and Reflective Judgment* (1999), *Kant's Conception of Pedagogy: Toward Education for Freedom* (2012), and articles on Kant's moral philosophy, anthropology, and pedagogical writings. She is the translator of Kant's 1775–6 Friedländer anthropology lectures (2012) in the Cambridge University Press series, The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant.

SUSAN MELD SHELL is Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at Boston College. Her books include *The Rights of Reason: A Study of Kant's Philosophy and Politics* (1980); *The Embodiment of Reason: Kant on Spirit, Generation and Community* (1996); *Kant and the Limits of Autonomy* (2009); and (edited, with Richard Velkley) *Kant's "Observations" and "Remarks": A Critical Guide* (2012).

WERNER STARK is Honorarprofessor at Philipps-University, Marburg, and wissenschaftlicher Angestellter, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie

der Wissenschaften: Arbeitsstelle Kant-Ausgabe, Potsdam. He is co-editor of *Kants gesammelte Schriften*, Volume 25 (*Vorlesungen über Anthropologie*, 1997) and editor of Volume 26 (*Vorlesungen über physische Geographie*, forthcoming). He is also author of *Nachforschungen zu Briefen und Handschriften Immanuel Kants* (1993) and has been general editor and contributor to the series *Kant-Forschungen* (Volumes I–I3).

ERIC WATKINS is Professor of Philosophy at the University of California, San Diego. He is the author of *Kant and the Metaphysics of Causality* (2005) and the editor of *Kant and the Sciences* (2001) and *Immanuel Kant: Natural Science* (2012). He is also the translator of *Kant's Critique of Pure Reason: Background Source Materials* (2009).

CATHERINE WILSON is Anniversary Professor of Philosophy at the University of York. Her most recent book is *Epicureanism at the Origins of Modernity* (2008). She is the author of a number of essays on Kant's anthropology and his critical methodology.

ALLEN W. WOOD is Ruth Norman Halls Professor at Indiana University, Bloomington and Ward W. and Priscilla B. Woods Professor Emeritus at Stanford University. He is author of eleven books and editor or translator of twelve others, mainly in the areas of Kant and German idealism, and moral and political philosophy. His most recent publication is *The Free Development of Each: Studies on Freedom, Right and Ethics in Classical German Philosophy* (2014).

JOHN H. ZAMMITO is John Antony Weir Professor of History at Rice University. His publications include *The Genesis of Kant's Critique of Judgment* (1992), *Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology* (2002), and *A Nice Derangement of Epistemes: Post-positivism in the Study of Science from Quine to Latour* (2004).

Preface

The idea for this volume grew out of conversations I had with Thomas Sturm, and in particular one that took place at the 11th International Kant Congress in Pisa in May 2010. We agreed that the publication of the *Lectures on Anthropology* in the German Academy edition of Kant's *Gesammelte Schriften* (1997) and the (then forthcoming and now published) translation of these *Lectures* in the series of the Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant provided an opportune moment to take stock of their historical importance and philosophical relevance. Although unfortunately our original project did not come to fruition, it prompted the work on this volume, for which I am grateful.

This volume would not have been possible without the help of many people. First, I would like to thank Hilary Gaskin for helping me bring the project to completion – her constant support throughout the process is very much appreciated. I also want to express my gratitude to all the contributors for making my life much easier by providing fantastic contributions. Particular thanks go to Werner Stark, whose piece on the history of the *Lectures* was a welcome late addition to an already rich volume, to Joshua Mendelsohn, who went beyond the call of duty and spent his holidays translating this piece so that it could be included in time for publication, and to Jonathan Head for compiling a very thorough index.

I am also very grateful to the editors of the translations of Kant's *Lectures on Anthropology*, Robert Clewis, Robert Loudon, G. Felicitas Munzel and Allen Wood, as well as Cambridge University Press, for sharing the early proofs of their work with the contributors to this volume. My thanks are also due to two anonymous external readers whose positive comments and feedback were of great assistance whilst assembling the contributions. Finally I would like to acknowledge a big debt to others at the Press,

and in particular Rosemary Crawley and Gillian Dadd, for their help and understanding when inevitable delays emerged.

On a more personal note, I would like to thank Cain Todd for his ongoing faith in me despite evidence to the contrary, and Noa for her special brand of joyful support.

Translations and abbreviations

Kant's works are cited in the body of the text according to the volume and page number in *Immanuel Kants Schriften*, Ausgabe der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1902–), abbreviated in the list below as “Ak.” Unless noted otherwise in their essays, authors use translations from the Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant, series editors Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992–).

The following abbreviations are used to refer to specific works by Kant.

A	<i>Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht</i> (1798), Ak 7
AF	<i>Anthropology from a Pragmatic Standpoint</i> <i>Vorlesungen über Anthropologie</i> Friedländer (1775–6), Ak 25.1
AN	<i>Friedländer's Notes on Kant's Anthropology Lectures</i> <i>Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des</i> <i>Himmels</i> (1755), Ak 2
	<i>Universal Natural History and Theory of the</i> <i>Heavens</i>
Bem	<i>Bemerkungen zu den “Beobachtungen über das</i> <i>Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen”</i> (1764–5), Ak 20
	<i>Remarks in the “Observations on the Feeling of the</i> <i>Beautiful and Sublime”</i>
Beo	<i>Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und</i> <i>Erhabenen</i> (1764), Ak 2
	<i>Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and</i> <i>Sublime</i>
C	<i>Briefe</i> , Ak 10–13
	<i>Correspondence</i>

ED	<i>Das Ende aller Dinge</i> (1794), Ak 8 <i>The End of All Things</i>
EF	<i>Zum ewigen Frieden: Ein philosophischer Entwurf</i> (1795), Ak 8 <i>Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Project</i>
Em	<i>Der einzig mögliche Beweisgrund zu einer Demonstration des Dasein Gottes</i> (1763), Ak 2 <i>The Only Possible Argument in Support of a Demonstration of the Existence of God</i>
G	<i>Grundlegung der Metaphysik der Sitten</i> (1785), Ak 4 <i>Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals</i>
Idea	<i>Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht</i> (1784), Ak 8 <i>Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim</i>
KpV	<i>Kritik der praktischen Vernunft</i> (1788), Ak 5 <i>Critique of Practical Reason</i>
KrV	<i>Kritik der reinen Vernunft</i> (1781, 1787) <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i>
KU	<i>Kritik der Urteilkraft</i> (1790), Ak 5 <i>Critique of the Power of Judgment</i>
Log	<i>Logik</i> (1800), Ak 9 <i>Jäsche Logic</i>
MA	<i>Mutmaßlicher Anfang der Menschengeschichte</i> (1786), Ak 8 <i>Conjectural Beginning of Human History</i>
MAN	<i>Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft</i> (1786), Ak 4 <i>Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science</i>
MS	<i>Metaphysik der Sitten</i> (1797–98), Ak 6 <i>Metaphysics of Morals</i>
N	<i>Nachricht von der Einrichtung seiner Vorlesung in dem Winterhalbenjahre 1765–1766</i> (1765), Ak 2 <i>Mr. Immanuel Kant's Announcement of the Programme of His Lectures for the Winter Semester 1765–6</i>
PhilEnz	<i>Philosophische Enzyklopädie</i> , Ak 29 <i>Philosophical Encyclopedia</i> (1781–2)
PND	<i>Principiorum primorum cognitionis metaphysicae nova dilucidatio</i> (1755), Ak 1

	<i>A New Elucidation of the First Principles of Metaphysical Cognition</i>
PPH	<i>Praktische Philosophie</i> Herder (1762–4), Ak 27.1 <i>J. G. Herder's Notes on Kant's Practical Philosophy Lectures</i>
Prol	<i>Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik</i> <i>Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics</i> (1783), Ak 04
R	<i>Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft</i> (1793–4), Ak 6 <i>Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason</i>
Ref	<i>Reflexionen</i> , Ak 14–23 References here are to the number of the Reflection and then to the volume and the page of the Akademie edition
RezMoscati	<i>Recension von Moscatis Schrift: Von dem körperlichen wesentlichen Unterschiede zwischen der Structur der Thiere und Menschen</i> (1771), Ak 2 Review of Moscati's work <i>Of the Corporeal Essential Differences between the Structure of Animals and Humans</i>
RH	<i>Recensionen von J. G. Herders Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit</i> (1785), Ak 8 <i>Review of J. G. Herder's Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Humanity</i>
Ri	<i>Bemerkungen in den "Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen"</i> (1764–5), ed. M. Rischmüller (Felix Meiner, 1991) <i>Remarks on the "Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime"</i>
SF	<i>Der Streit der Fakultäten</i> (1798), Ak 7 <i>The Conflict of the Faculties</i>
SOS	<i>Aus Soemmerring über das Organ der Seele</i> (1796), Ak 12 <i>From Soemmerring's On the Organ of the Soul</i>
TP	<i>Über den Gemeinspruch: Das mag in der Theorie richtig sein, taugt aber nicht für die Praxis</i> (1793), Ak 8 <i>On the Common Saying: That May Be True in Theory, But It Is of No Use in Practice</i>

UD	<i>Untersuchung über die Deutlichkeit der Grundsätze der natürlichen Theologie und der Moral</i> (1764), Ak 2 <i>Inquiry Concerning the Distinctness of the Principles of Natural Theology and Morality</i>
ÜGTP	<i>Über den Gebrauch teleologischer Principien in der Philosophie</i> (1788), Ak 8 <i>On the Use of Teleological Principles in Philosophy</i>
VA-name	<i>Vorlesungen über Anthropologie</i> , followed by the name of the note taker, Ak 25 <i>Lectures on Anthropology</i>
VL-name	<i>Vorlesungen über Logik</i> , followed by the name of the note taker, Ak 24 <i>Lectures on Logic</i>
VM-name	<i>Vorlesungen über Metaphysik</i> , followed by the name of the note taker, Ak 28, 29 <i>Lectures on Metaphysics</i>
VMo-name	<i>Vorlesungen über Moralphilosophie</i> , followed by the name of the note taker, Ak 27, 29 <i>Lectures on Moral Philosophy</i>
VNR-Feyerabend	<i>Naturrecht Feyerabend</i> (1784), Ak 27 <i>Kant's Lectures on Natural Right</i>
VP	<i>Über Pädagogik</i> (1803), Ak 9 <i>Lectures on Pedagogy</i>
V-PG	<i>Vorlesungen über physische Geographie</i> , Ak 26 <i>Lectures on Physical Geography</i>
VvRM	<i>Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschen</i> (1775), Ak 2 <i>Of the Different Races of Human Beings</i>
WA	<i>Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?</i> (1784), Ak 8 <i>An Answer to the Question: What Is Enlightenment?</i>

Introduction

Alix Cohen

Kant intended his lectures on anthropology to teach students how to apply what they learnt at university to their future profession as well as to the conduct of their life in general.¹ As he writes to Markus Herz toward the end of 1773, his

lecture course on *Anthropologie* . . . [will] disclose the sources of all the [practical] sciences, the science of morality, of skill, of human intercourse, of the way to educate and govern human beings, and thus of everything that pertains to the practical. (C 10:145)²

The pedagogical aim of this course was to help his students become citizens of the world by showing them how to make their knowledge relevant, applicable and useful. Famously, these lectures were popular not only in terms of their style but also in terms of their audience. One of Kant's amanuenses, Reinhold Bernhard Jachmann, reported that they were 'an extremely pleasant instruction' that commanded the most attendance of all of Kant's lectures, including from outside the University of Königsberg.³

¹ Volume 25 of the Academy edition of *Kant's gesammelte Schriften* (Göttingen, 1997), as well as its English translation (Cambridge University Press, 2013), contains extremely useful introductions detailing the nature of the transcripts, their historical background and composition (Brandt and Stark (1997), vii–cli, and Wood (2013), 1–10). Due to restrictions of space, I refer to them for a presentation of Kant's *Lectures* as well as to Werner Stark's contribution in this volume. See also Lestition (1985), 752–66; Brandt and Stark (1997), vii–cli; and Wilson (2006), 7–26 for a presentation of the lectures and their reception, and Zammito (2002), 293–302; and Wilson (1991) for an account of their genesis.

² See also 'This knowledge of the world serves to procure the pragmatic element for all otherwise acquired sciences and skills, by means of which they become useful not merely for the school but rather for life and through which the accomplished apprentice is introduced to the stage of his destiny, namely, the world' (VvRM 2:443). As Lestition summed up, Kant intended his lecture course to 'provide a sort of "plan" or "general knowledge" which facilitates a subsequent broadening of the factual learning acquired at school, and to stimulate a broader reading public – that is, amateurs who enjoyed cultural concerns – to reflect upon the suitability of any given set of ordering principles for the study of men as they exist in the world' (Lestition (1989), 757).

³ Quoted in Jacobs and Kain (2003b), 13. As Kuehn notes, 'the lectures on anthropology . . . were to become the most accessible of all his lectures. While students dreaded his lectures on logic and

Their popularity led students to produce transcripts that were traded and handed down from year to year, and they eventually formed the basis of the published *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* in 1798.

Yet their legacy was short-lived and since then they have been largely ignored.⁴ On the few occasions they have been mentioned, they were deemed a peculiar collection of more or less pointless remarks on a variety of random topics vaguely related to human beings – starting from Schleiermacher's 1799 review, which describes the *Anthropology* as a 'collection of trivialities' (Schleiermacher (1998), 16).⁵ This disappointing reception can be partly accounted for by their often unexpected, at times odd, and occasionally incongruous character. Their subject matter ranges from entertainment to marriage, bodily functions, fashion, humour, sex, smoking and sleeping patterns – topics that seem a far cry from Kant's more familiar transcendental concerns.⁶ Moreover, the most charitable interpretative tools have remained powerless in the face of his repeated discussions of human races, gender differences or national characteristics, where stereotyping, prejudice and bigotry abound.⁷ As a result, until recently, the *Lectures on Anthropology* have generally been viewed as peculiar, uncritical

metaphysics, they seem genuinely to have enjoyed his lectures on anthropology' (Kuehn (2001), 204–5).

⁴ Similarly, Kant's anthropological work has received only superficial attention within the history and philosophy of the social sciences. This is partly due to the fact that it has not been perceived as being in continuity with the discipline as social scientists know it. As Brandt has noted, 'The *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* remained a stray piece in the history of sciences' (Brandt (1999), 43). Similarly for Zammito, 'There is reason to question whether Kant's vision of what anthropology as a discipline should become had any sustained impact on the subsequent development of that field. I have taken the view that it was far less influential than rival versions – both at home and abroad' (Zammito, this volume, 248; see also Zammito (2002), 301 ff.). As Barnard sums up from the perspective of the history of anthropology, 'While Lévi-Strauss once argued that Rousseau was the founder of the social sciences, Radcliffe-Brown gave that honour to Montesquieu; and the styles of the later structuralist and structural-functionalist traditions do owe much to the respective rationalism of Rousseau and empiricism of Montesquieu' (Barnard (2000), 23).

⁵ Amongst many others, Hinske argued that for Kant, anthropology is 'a science of questionable thoroughness and [therefore] subordinate' (Hinske (1961), 410); Kaag talked about it as one of 'Kant's lesser works' (Kaag (2005), 535); and Eze often referred to its 'peculiar nature' (Eze (1997), 105); whilst for Brandt, they do not belong 'to philosophy in a strict sense' (Brandt (1999), 7).

⁶ Respectively in VA-Friedländer 25:568–9, 25:703, 25:706, VA-Mrongovius 25:1247–8, 25:1328–9, VA-Friedländer 25:518–9, 25:601, 25:714, VA-Mrongovius 25:1336, VA-Friedländer 25:528.

⁷ The lectures on anthropology are not alone in this unfortunate position. As far as stereotyping is concerned, it occurs in other lecture notes, including the *Lectures on Geography*, as well as the *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*, the essays *Of the Different Races of Human Beings*, *On the Use of Teleological Principles in Philosophy*, and *Determination of the Concept of a Human Race*, and of course the published version of the lectures on anthropology, the *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*. For a nuanced and insightful analysis of the relationship between Kant's views on race and the rest of his philosophy, see Frierson (2013), 104–7. See also Eze (1995); Larrimore (1999); Loudon (2000), 93–106; Boxill and Hill (2001).

and possibly anomalous works that do not belong to the Kantian system as such.

However, since the publication of the *Lectures on Anthropology* in the German Academy edition of Kant's *Gesammelte Schriften* (1997), the new English translation of the *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* (CUP, 2006) and the publication of the volume *Anthropology, History and Education* (CUP, 2007), this situation has started to change. In the Anglo-American tradition for instance, the first substantial works dedicated to Kant's anthropology date from the year 2000, with Robert Loudon's *Kant's Impure Ethics*; 2002, with John Zammito's *Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology*; and 2003, with Patrick Frierson's *Freedom and Anthropology in Kant's Moral Philosophy*, as well as Brian Jacobs and Patrick Kain's *Essays on Kant's Anthropology*.⁸ Since then, studies have multiplied, including Wilson (2006), Cohen (2009a) and Sturm (2009). This surge of attention among Kant scholars has finally established the *Lectures on Anthropology* as worthy of study in their own right and hence makes the appearance of this Critical Guide very timely.

This collection of essays sets out to offer the first comprehensive assessment of Kant's *Lectures on Anthropology*, their philosophical importance, their evolution and their relationship to his critical philosophy. It is based on the belief that they lie at the intersection of many core Kantian concerns and thus offer an ideal standpoint for the exploration of a wide range of topics, from the epistemological and the psychological to the moral and cultural. The thematic approach of the Critical Guide series is particularly well suited to the *Lectures*, for it enables the emergence of common themes from what may appear at first to be disparate areas of anthropological discourse. But before summarising individual contributions, I would like to show that, taken in its entirety, this volume provides us with a whole range of reasons why paying close attention to the *Lectures on Anthropology* will enrich current debates within Kant scholarship.

First, the *Lectures* contribute to our understanding of the overall evolution of Kant's thought. As the lecture course that Kant gave most frequently (from 1772–3 to 1795–6), and as one of the few texts available from Kant's 'silent decade' (1771–81), they provide a record that is extremely useful in understanding the development of his views and in tracking their evolution. For instance, Susan Shell's detailed analysis of the *Friedländer Lectures* (1775–6) shows that a crucial shift takes place in this period. Kant's

⁸ This is apart from Van de Pitte's relatively anecdotal *Kant as Philosophical Anthropologist* (1971), which offered an early study of Kant's anthropological project. For studies in other languages, see for instance Foucault (2008); Firla (1981); Manganoro (1983); Kim (1992); Ferrari (1997); Potesta (2004).

confident defence of vitalism, which takes the form of the unity of the biological and the moral is, according to her, one of the last remnants of his pre-critical commitments, soon after to be dropped as transcendental idealism emerges. Rudolf Makkreel's contribution also brings to light shifts that show an important transformation in Kant's thinking, from the early suggestion that we can intuit ourselves to the later claim that self-observation is fraught with difficulties. Likewise, Patrick Frierson observes striking changes in Kant's account of affects and passions. On this basis he argues that, from his early lectures right through to the *Anthropology*, Kant increasingly differentiates between them and their respective moral valuations. For his part, John Zammito deplores the lack of systematic integration of Kant's critical philosophy with his anthropology. The 'Anthropological Characteristics' section of the *Lectures* is remarkably stable in spite of changes both in his critical philosophy and in the wider anthropological discourse over the same period, which he interprets as a failure on Kant's part. Paul Guyer analyses the development of Kant's thought on the inclination to freedom, and concludes that his mature idea about freedom is not reflected in the *Lectures on Anthropology* of the period. Accounting for these discrepancies helps us make better sense of the unique point of view the *Lectures* adopt. This needs further elucidations since the use of the term 'pragmatic' to qualify Kant's anthropological project has been the subject of recent debates.

The intended function of the *Lectures* is to provide 'knowledge of the world' – knowledge that Kant calls 'pragmatic' from the *Friedländer Lectures* (1775–6) onwards.⁹ For some commentators, the realm of the pragmatic is merely coextensive with happiness, prudence and skill, including the use of others to achieve our ends; for others it can include the realm of the moral.¹⁰ The difficulty in demarcating its legitimate boundaries is a particular instance of a more general tension within Kant's transcendental framework, between his metaphysics, his account of freedom in particular, and his anthropology.¹¹ The possibility of the reconciliation, if not the integration, of Kant's anthropological work with the rest of his corpus is thus an ongoing task, and one to which this volume contributes in

⁹ 'The second part of knowledge of the world is knowledge of human beings, who are considered inasmuch as their knowledge is of interest to us in life. Therefore human beings are not studied in speculative terms, but pragmatic, in the application of their knowledge according to rules of prudence, and this is anthropology' (VA-Friedländer 25:470).

¹⁰ For the former, see Wood (1999), 203–5, Brandt (2003), 92; for the latter, see Frierson (2003), 80; Stark (2003), 21; and Cohen (2009a), 62.

¹¹ See Gregor (1974), xvii, 5; Wood (1999), 206; Loudon (2000), 19; Jacobs and Kain (2003a); Cohen (2009b), 114; Sturm (2011).

significant ways. Insofar as they are Kant's 'anthropologising' in action, the *Lectures* contain an abundance of vivid, sometimes perplexing, but often instructive examples of what he has in mind when he talks about pragmatic anthropology as 'the investigation of what he as a free-acting being makes of himself, or can and should make of himself' (A 7:119).¹² For instance, as Gary Hatfield argues in his contribution, even the theoretical knowledge of the senses has a pragmatic function for Kant. Not only does he advise his students on how to use them, from choosing the colour of their clothes to cultivating the ability to overlook blemishes, he also shows that understanding how the senses work can help correct our unguided phenomenological impression of the direction of causation in vision (Hatfield (2014)). In this respect at least, anthropological knowledge is, if not essential, then at least helpful to the realisation of human endeavours, no matter how modest. This is why it is often described as map: 'a moral map that [human beings] can use to move toward their collective destiny' (Louden (2000), 106), 'a map-making venture' (Cohen (2009a), 105). Yet Zammito (this volume, 246) raises doubts about its supposed usefulness: it is 'almost a *contemplative* (academic?) wisdom, [rather than] a guide for action (in the world)'. His conclusion that Kant's *Lectures* seemed 'rather a vehicle for Kant to exercise his categorising propensity' (this volume, 239) will no doubt appeal to many reluctant readers of Kant.

However, beyond the issue of the immediate value of Kant's particular anthropological recommendations, what is at stake in accounting for the function of the *Lectures on Anthropology* as a whole is the determination of their systematic connections with his critical philosophy. Some contributions in this volume emphasise the discrepancies between Kant's account in the *Lectures* and his critical philosophy. For instance, Catherine Wilson brings to light the paradoxes that are at the basis of Kant's thoughts about human nature as it develops historically and anthropologically. She claims that whilst his moral philosophy defends the normative demands of humanity as an end in itself, the account of human nature presented in the *Lectures* praises conflict, civil coercion and discipline as necessary for the progress of civilisation. Other contributions argue in favour of the complementarity of the *Lectures* with Kant's other writings. G. Felicitas

¹² As one of his students notes, 'His oral presentation was simple and without affectation. In Physical geography and in anthropology he was lively. The former had a more general appeal, and it was well suited to his talent as a story-teller. The latter gained from his incidental observations of minute details either drawn from his own experience or from his readings – especially from that of the best English novelists. One never left his lectures without having learned something, or without having been pleasantly entertained' (quoted in Kuehn (2001), 274).

Munzel shows how reading them alongside each other allows us to see the continuity and development of his account of human nature, whether in its moral or cognitive dimensions. She argues, for instance, that whilst the former identify the problem of establishing and appropriately using the principles of judgment in relation to the world in which human beings find themselves, the articulation of the appropriate principles and their use is the ongoing work of the critical philosophy.

Going further in this direction, the *Lectures on Anthropology* contribute to our understanding of Kant's philosophy as a system in crucial ways. First by enabling us to flesh out its empirical dimension, a dimension that is usually understated, if at all present, in the rest of the corpus, they provide an opportunity to consider issues that remain relatively underexplored within Kant's thought – as Patrick Frierson shows for the nature of affective states, or Gary Hatfield illustrates for the role of the senses.¹³ Furthermore, as Janowiak and Watkins note, Kant's primary goal in the first *Critique* is not to offer a comprehensive account of cognition in general but merely to explain its necessary a priori structures. The *Lectures* are thus, they contend, an invaluable resource for attaining a fuller understanding of Kant's larger project. By accounting for the contingent, empirical modes in which our faculties operate, they illuminate Kant's understanding of the operations and functions of the human mind and thereby supplement the transcendental account presented in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. More generally, they offer untapped resources for those interested in everyday cognition, perception and philosophical psychology. They also contribute to the ongoing re-evaluation of Kant's practical philosophy. As Allen Wood argues, they comprise an account of affective states according to which they differ from each other in important respects, and these differences have implications for their relationship to reason, deliberation and value. In particular, Kant's supposed hostility to the emotions in the *Groundwork* sits uneasily with the account of feelings presented here since the latter comprise rational valuations. In addition, Robert Louden claims that Kant's anthropological assumptions have crucial ethical implications. First, Kant's exclusion of happiness from humanity's biological development explains his opposition to utilitarianism in ethics, since moral theories that encourage humans to aim directly at happiness contradict nature's plan for the species. Second, it is because nature's

¹³ As Kain and Jacobs have noted in the Introduction to the *Essays on Kant's Anthropology*, 'Kant's anthropology lectures present the acting and knowing subject as fully constituted in human flesh and blood, with the specific virtues and foibles that make it properly human' (Jacobs and Kain (2003b), 6).

distribution of the drive to work is uneven that he is committed to the claim that some peoples have the necessary inherent drives to progress and others do not.

Needless to say, I could list many more reasons to read Kant's *Lectures on Anthropology*. But I hope that the ones I have listed here will suffice to entice the reader to delve into this volume as well as into the *Lectures* themselves.

Whilst the volume engages with the central issues raised in the *Lectures*, exhaustiveness is impossible, as is unavoidable for such collections, and a number of issues are too briefly covered, if at all. For instance, Kant's treatments of race, gender or mental disorders, although discussed, have no thorough treatment here.¹⁴ The structure of the volume mirrors that of the *Anthropology* and the *Lectures on Anthropology* themselves, starting from the Didactic, which tackles the cognitive faculty, the feeling of pleasure and displeasure and the faculty of desire, followed by the Anthropological Characteristics, with issues including education, culture and cosmopolitanism.

In 'Self-cognition and self-assessment', Rudolf Makkreel engages with the limits of introspective self-observation by examining the compensatory approaches that allow us to become aware of ourselves. He concludes that self-cognition is not learning what inner sense has passively assimilated but determining what reason can actively appropriate as part of a project of self-assessment and character formation.

In 'Kant on the phenomenology of touch and vision', Gary Hatfield sets out to situate Kant's remarks on touch and vision within the context of his pragmatic anthropology. He concludes that Kant's method of observation is drawn from everyday life, a kind of everyday phenomenology of sensory experience that partly relies on the theoretical apparatus of empirical psychology. Such intermixture of 'school learning' and theory with observations drawn from life is, he believes, characteristic of Kant's writing and lectures in anthropology.

In 'Meat on the bones: Kant's account of cognition in the anthropology lectures', Tim Jankowiak and Eric Watkins examine Kant's discussion of the empirical features of cognition in the *Lectures on Anthropology* and show that they add content to the view of cognition that emerges from the first *Critique*. Thus if the first *Critique* describes a bare-bones skeleton

¹⁴ Kant's treatments of race, gender and mental disorders are discussed respectively in Loudon, Shell, Wilson and Zammito, Cohen and Wilson, and Janowiak and Watkins. For extensive discussions of these issues, see Eze (1995); Kleingeld (2007); Larrimore (1999); Shell (1996); Schott (1997); Mikkola (2011); David-Ménard (2000); Makkreel (2001b); and Frierson (2009) respectively.

of some of the necessary conditions of a priori cognition, Kant's *Lectures* puts a healthy amount of empirical meat on the bones of his a priori account.

In 'The anthropology of cognition and its pragmatic implications', I argue that it is because of our cognitive nature as embodied human beings that we need not only a critique of pure reason, but also an anthropology of empirical reason – a pragmatic account of how we can, should and ought to cognise insofar as we are embodied human beings. The function of Kant's anthropology of cognition is thus to illuminate the empirical, contingent and messy features of human cognition in order to help us become better, more efficient knowers.

In 'Affects and passions', Patrick Frierson argues that to make sense of Kant's claim that passions can only be conquered with difficulty whilst affects do not allow reflection (A 7:251), we need to provide a psychological account that explains them in terms of feeling and inclination. He concludes that passions are disordered inclinations while affects are disordered feelings.

Paul Guyer's contribution focuses on 'The inclination towards freedom' and its cultivation. His question is whether and when the development of Kant's central idea in moral philosophy became reflected in his *Lectures on Anthropology*. He argues that while Kant asserted the existence of a powerful inclination to one's *own* freedom as the condition of the possibility of one's own *happiness* early in the anthropology lectures, it was only later that he introduced the idea that freedom is more than this.

In 'Empirical desire', Allen Wood proposes a taxonomy of our affective states, including desire, inclination, feeling, passion and affect. On this basis, he argues that Kant's treatment of empirical desire in the *Lectures on Anthropology* emphasises the way these desires pose an obstacle to rational self-government. He concludes that an affect is an excess of feeling that temporarily overwhelms our rational self-control, while passion is empirical desire, developed and modified by free choice.

In 'Kant as "vitalist": The "principium of life" in *Anthropologie Friedländer*', Susan Shell provides a detailed analysis of the *Anthropologie Friedländer* through the prism of the concept of vitalism. She shows that it defends a conception of pragmatic anthropology that can unite the higher principles of activity and the lower principles of life, in contrast to Kant's mature conception of the dichotomy between reason and nature. Yet, she argues, this account of their relation is only provisional, soon replaced by an account of spontaneity that offers no apparent means of reconciliation between them.

In 'Indispensable education of the being of reason and speech', G. Felicitas Munzel argues that the cultivation of reason is intrinsic to the very nature of the being of reason and speech. She bases her interpretation on the analysis of three sections of the *Friedländer Lectures*: 'On the Use of Reason with Regard to the Practical', 'On the Character of Humanity in General', and 'On Education'.

In 'Kant on civilisation, culture and moralisation', Catherine Wilson explores Kant's account of civilisation, culture and moralisation from the perspective of three issues, namely secularisation, animalism and historical pessimism. Whilst Kant is a proponent of secularisation, she argues, he rejects animalism and the historical pessimism that often accompany it, and this sets him apart in the wider context of the emergence of anthropology as a discipline in the eighteenth century.

In 'Cosmopolitical unity: the final destiny of the human species', Robert Loudon focuses on Kant's account of the character of the human species and in particular humanity's predisposition toward what he calls 'cosmopolitical unity'. He shows that Kant is far from naive about the inherent difficulties of establishing cosmopolitical unity, and that in this sense, he is not overly optimistic regarding humanity's future.

In 'What a young man needs for his venture into the world: the function and evolution of the "Characteristics"', John Zammito analyses the 'Anthropological Characteristics' section of the *Lectures on Anthropology* and concludes that in spite of slight changes of emphasis (in particular between predictability as a measure enabling effective negotiation with others and accountability as a measure of approval or disapproval of others), the invariance of Kant's pedagogical purpose permitted its relative stability.

*Kant's lectures on anthropology:
some orienting remarks*

Werner Stark

Translated by Joshua Mendelsohn

Thanks to the diligence of Königsberg students and coincidences regarding the text's transmission, we have access to two largely independent sets of notes from Kant's first semester-long course of lectures on anthropology (1772–3). Allusions and direct citations in the text attest in multiple ways to the influence of the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, particularly of *Émile* and the *Second Discourse*.¹ Wherever one finds Kant's method of a structured, even constructed, lecture, decisive points of contact with Rousseau become apparent. This is especially clear in the 'Introductions', which can also be read as a programmatic presentation of the course structure. As a teacher, Kant constantly strives to deliver what he promises. In the Collins transcript, we read:

[1] We will consider the human mind in all its conditions, in health and in sickness, in a confused and uncultivated condition, to establish the first principles [*principien*] of taste and the adjudication of the beautiful, the principles [*principien*] of pathology, sensitivity and inclinations. [2] We will mention the different ages and especially the sexes in their character, and seek to draw them from their sources. [3] From this will follow what is natural to the human being and what is artificial or habitual about him; that will be [a] the most difficult and our chief object, to distinguish the human being insofar as he is natural from the human being as he has been transformed by upbringing and other influences, [b] to consider the mind separated from the body, and [c] to seek, mediated by observations, whether the influence of the body is necessarily required for thinking. (VA-Collins 25:8 f.)²

¹ Cf. Stark (2014). Due to the nature of the subject matter, some correspondence with formulations used in the present essay was unavoidable.

² The bracketed numbers and letters which I have introduced are to be understood as follows: the first part follows Baumgarten's textbook, *Metaphysica*, Pars II, Caput I: Psychologia empirica §§504–739. The second part of the lecture proceeds without reference to the *Metaphysica*; its construction is reminiscent of Kant's 1764 *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*. Third, a broader project is pursued, which permeates the entire text, arguing (a) for and against Rousseau, (b) and (c) against Ernst Platner and others (cf. C 10:145, A 7:119, 176, VA 25:085, 472, 856, 1211). The

Indicating the course structure considerably less, Parow writes:

In treating this doctrine we want to discuss human beings in different conditions, e.g. in uncultivated and uncivilised [*roh und ungesittet*] conditions, in accordance with their different ages, and to distinguish what is natural and artificial [*Natur und Kunst*] in a human being. (VA-Parow 25:244)

Both formulations bear clear witness to the concept of 'natural man' introduced by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the *Second Discourse*. This refers neither to the thought experiment of man in a fictional 'state of nature', as in Locke or Hobbes, for example, nor to a scientific reconstruction of prehistoric human beings. Rather, Rousseau assumes that his 'natural or savage man' is equipped with the same senses and natural attributes as an infant born in his own day. Kant follows this approach in his *Anthropology*, but over time, the results and conclusions he draws from it become increasingly distant from its inventor's approach. In short, we might put the point by saying that Kant took Rousseau to have posed the right question, but not to have given the right answer.

From the start, Kant's lectures on anthropology are divided into two parts. After a short, programmatic introduction, there follows first an empirical psychology modeled after the third part of Baumgarten's *Metaphysica* (cf. Baumgarten (2011)). However, Kant's structuring assumption of three different 'capacities' (*Vermögen*) occurs neither in Baumgarten's *Metaphysics* nor in his *Ethics* (Heinz (2011)).³ Kant holds that every person is capable of (a) knowing, (b) feeling and (c) desiring. Connected by a superordinate or preordinate self-consciousness, these three capabilities form the 'soul' or interior of the human being.

For the initially untitled second part (later dubbed the 'Characteristics'), there is no textbook precedent.⁴ As far as we can tell, Sectio XXII

relationship between the soul and the body (*Metaphysica* §§733–9) is not treated. It should also be mentioned that (c) relies on passages from *Dreams of a Spirit Seer* (2:370–3). For the corresponding reference to the field of medicine, see the earlier notes of Collins (VA-Collins 25:218), and Parow (VA-Parow 25:436). Pillau (1777–8) and *Menschenkunde* (1781–2) give some hints as to the disease-like phenomena that appear at the interface of body and soul (VA-Pillau 25:813–4, VA-Menschenkunde 25:1156). More extensive evidence is given by Friedländer (1775–6) and Mrongovius (1784–5) (VA-Friedländer 25:624–6, VA-Mrongovius 25:1364–7).

³ The newly posed question of the origin of the three basic faculties (knowing, feeling and desiring) of the first part of the lectures foreshadows the questions of the *Critiques*, first published between 1781 and 1790. Pure reason is directed towards the true, practical reason investigates the good, and the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* contains a doctrine of taste or aesthetic as its first part – its interest is in the beautiful and the sublime. The last *Critique* in particular refers the matter to the 1764, entirely world-oriented *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*.

⁴ First in the transcript of Pillau, dated from 1777–8: 'The Characteristic. It serves to distinguish the characters (*Caractère*). Character means nothing other than a general mark to distinguish people' (VA-Pillau 25:814; my translation).

(‘commercium animae et corporis’) of the *Metaphysica* seems to have served as the occasion for Kant to broaden his discussion. The proximity of this discussion to medicine functions to bridge the presentation of two traditional, associated theories:⁵ a theory of temperaments, which distinguishes between sanguines, phlegmatics, melancholics and choleric, and a polemically argued physiognomy. Finally, two other manifest human differences are treated. The characters of the genders (man/woman) are treated from the outset like the different nations of Europe.⁶ To use a modern turn of phrase, the second part of the lecture could be described on the whole as ‘differential psychology’.⁷ From the mid-1770s, variously executed but similarly intentioned presentations of this sort came to conclude and climax in an attempt to characterise the human species as a whole. This internal development,⁸ which is also reflected in novel terminology, includes Kant’s *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* (1798).

The *Anthropology* lecture was first delivered in the winter of 1772–3, so that, at least temporally, it stood in close proximity to Kant’s adoption of the professorship in logic and metaphysics. A glance over the basic curriculum of the reformed universities in the German-speaking territories quickly makes clear that, just like at the beginning of his academic career as a *Privatdozent* in the winter of 1755–6, Kant gives a lecture that does not fall within any of the canonical philosophical subjects (Scheible (1997)).⁹ Thus, besides the lecture on ‘physical geography’ first held in the summer of 1756, there appears a second, similarly private, lecture, which was, however, always held in the winter months, the anthropology lecture. From the outset, it was made clear to students that the lectures on anthropology in

⁵ Cf. footnote 2 above.

⁶ At the same time, Kant refrains from making observations about Europeans in the lectures on Physical Geography held from 1756; the inhabitants of the other continents remain present, despite significant abbreviations. Cf. Stark (2010); Stark (2011).

⁷ In the received transcripts, the second part always has a significantly smaller extent than the part devoted to empirical psychology. The percentage devoted to ‘characteristics’ in each of them is, respectively: Collins: 10 per cent; Parow: 20 per cent; Friedlaender: 40 per cent; Pillau: 28 per cent; Menschenkunde: 10 per cent; Mrongovius: 25 per cent; Reichel: 25 per cent; Naumburg: 28 per cent. The corresponding amount in the edition published by Kant in 1798 is 23 per cent. The Friedländer transcript from the mid-1770s, which is especially noteworthy in this respect, presents (like the notes of Prieger transmitted in parallel) its own section ‘On education [*von der Erziehung*]’ (VA- Friedländer 25:722–8). The subject matter may be assumed to correspond to a lecture ‘Collegio scholastico practicum’ first held by Kant in the winter of 1776–7. This section has not yet been traced back to the lecture, which has been established as an official duty for the Philosophical Faculty on 13 July 1774.

⁸ For example, talk of ‘progress’ (*Fortschritt*) first occurs in the mid-1770s. Cf. Kant (2004), 365 (#240).

⁹ Of the eight ordinary professors who had usually belonged to the philosophy faculty of the Königsberg Albertina since its foundation in 1544, in Kant’s time only two could strictly speaking be called ‘philosophical’: (1) logic and metaphysics, (2) ethics and natural law, (3) eloquence and history, (4) poetry, (5) the Greek language, (6) oriental languages, (7) mathematics and (8) physics. On this, see also Oberhausen and Pozzo (1999).

no way constituted a separate treatment of some specific branch of the *Metaphysics*, but rather were to be understood as a fledgling field of inquiry in their own right. As a later student account puts it,

If one uses anthropology for social intercourse, it becomes knowledge of the world. We can use it every day in conversations, practical affairs, and with regard to ourselves [*in Ansehung unserer selbst*], and through new observations we can illustrate it more and more. No one has yet treated anthropology from such a perspective, namely, as knowledge of the world, and Herr Professor Kant is the first to have made a plan of it and to have lectured on it in his courses. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1211)

Without going further into the internal structure of what was, viewed as a whole, a novel field of study,¹⁰ we can still say without any doubt that Kant is drawing on a broad, contemporary European literature. A range of primarily English and French authors are referred to or explicitly mentioned, including Joseph Addison; Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux; Edmund Burke; Philipp Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield; Henry Fielding; Bernard Le Bouyer de Fontenelle; Alexander Gerard; Claude Adrien Helvétius; Henry Home, Lord Kames; François de La Rochefoucauld; John Milton; Michel Eyquem de Montaigne; Alexander Pope; Anthony Ashley Cooper, third Earl of Shaftesbury; William Shakespeare; Laurence Sterne; Jonathan Swift; François Marie Arouet de Voltaire; and Edward Young.¹¹ The vast majority of these are authors of the eighteenth century.

From the works of these authors I would like to highlight one title, in which the de facto motto of this new science is contained, although to be sure Kant never quotes it. Perhaps the best-known line of Alexander Pope's *Essay on Man* reads: 'The proper study of mankind is Man' (quoted in Brookes (1740)).¹² In contrast to what has been assumed in previous Kant

¹⁰ The doctrine of taste enters the anthropology lectures in place of sectio VIII, 'iudicium' (*Metaphysica*, §§606–9). This theory inserted here is treated in connection with sectio XV, 'voluptas et taedium' (§§656–62). According to it, it belongs (in Baumgarten's systematic) to the realm of the *facultas appetitiva* (§§651–732) and not only to the *facultas cognoscitiva* (§§519–650). Cf. VA-*Collins* 25:174–204, VA-*Parow* 25:374–402. The discussion in the Logik-Philippi provides a helpful supplementary reconstruction of the Kantian doctrine of taste at the beginning of the 1770s (VL-*Philippi* 24:344–53).

¹¹ Cf. the bibliography and index of names in Ak 25.

¹² The edition offers the parallel texts of the 'Essay on Man' in German and English. Only the English text on the left contains a line numbering running through each epistle. The beginning of the second epistle, 'Of the Nature and State of Man, with respect to Himself as an Individual' (rendered by Brookes as '*Von der Natur und dem Zustande des Menschen in Ansehung auf sich und als einzeln Wesen betrachtet*') reads: 'Know then thy self, presume not God to scan; / The proper study of mankind is Man [p. 33: So lerne dich selbst erkennen, und bilde dir so keck nicht ein: / Es werde gar die Gottheit selbst von deinem Geist entwickelt seyn. / Der Menschen Untersuchungs-Vorwurf ist eigentlich der Mensch allein].' The dry precision of the English original has been lost. On the relationship of the German translation in this edition to possible previous sources, see Lessing (1972), 790; and Keipert (2006).

scholarship, which supposes at least an occasional reliance on the English- or French-language original,¹³ I think it can be said on the basis of the range of textual evidence deriving from Kant's lectures on anthropology and physical geography that this was not the case.¹⁴

The early Kantian writing *Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens* contains four verse citations of the 1740 Brookes translation.¹⁵ Three come from the first epistle and one from the third:

First epistle: Of the Nature and State of Man with respect to the Universe.
(Brookes (1740), 2–31)

p. 4. 'or can a part contain the whole? Is the great Chain that draws all to agree,'¹⁶

p. 10. 'Heav'n from all creatures hides the book of fate, / All but the page prescrib'd their *present state*'¹⁷

pp. 24 f. 'Vast chain of Being! Which from God began, / Natures aethereal, human, angel, man, / Beast, bird, fish, insect! What no eye can see, / No glass can reach! From Infinite to thee, / From thee to Nothing!'¹⁸

p. 34. 'Superior Beings, when of late they saw / A mortal man unfold all Nature's law, / Admir'd such wisdom in an earthly shape/ And shew'd Newton as we show an Ape.'¹⁹

¹³ As Schlapp writes on Pope: 'Apparently Kant's favourite poet. From the considerations above, we can conclude that he must surely have read Pope in the original' (Schlapp (1901), 70; my translation). Schlapp refers to the following Logic notes from 1772: 'A timit rhyme-poet, and utmost despised; but with what joy one reads the verses of Pope when the rhymes seem natural and to have flowed from the subject matter itself' (VL-*Philippi* 24:371; my translation). See also Schlapp (1901), 422.

¹⁴ The first volume of the lectures on Physical Geography published in 2009 (V-PG 26.1) does not contain a student transcription of an oral lecture but rather Kant's own drafts. Extensive research into the textual references contained in student notes from the years 1770 to 1792 lends further support to the findings that had already been established in Ak 25 in 1997. Kant familiarised himself with the European literature of his day via recent German translations.

¹⁵ 'Pope in Brookes's Translation' (AN 1:318). Although the citations in Kant's text do not correspond word for word, there can be no doubt that they are based on Brookes's edition and translation.

¹⁶ 'Ist diese große Wunder-Kette, die alle Theile dieser Welt / Vereinet und zusammen zieht, und die das große Ganz erhält' (AN 1:241; Brookes (1740), 5).

¹⁷ 'Gott will, es soll des Schicksals Buch, der Creatur verborgen seyn, / Die Pagina der Gegenwart, entdeckt sich ihnen bloß allein' (AN 1:318; Brookes (1740), 11). Cited again in the Collins transcript from the first semester of the Anthropology lecture of 1772–3 (VA-Collins 25:121): 'Gott will, es soll das Schicksals Buch mir verborgen seyn, die pagina der Gegenwart entdeckt sie mir allein. Pope. [God wills it, the book of fate shall be hidden from me, only the page of the present reveals it to me; my translation]'.

¹⁸ 'Welch eine Kette, die von Gott den Anfang nimmt! was vor Naturen, / Von himmlischen und irdischen! der Engel, und der Mensch, das Vieh, / Die Vögel, Fisch und das Gewürm! O Weite, die das Auge nie, / Und ja so wenig die Gesichts-Kunst, erreichen und betrachten kann / Von dem Unendlichen zu Dir von Dir zum Nichts!' (AN 1:365; Brookes (1740), 25 f.).

¹⁹ 'Wie jüngst die obern Wesen sahn, / Was unlängst recht verwunderlich, / Ein Sterblicher bey uns gethan, / Und wie er der Natur Gesetz entfaltet; wunderten sie sich, / Daß, durch ein irdisches

Third epistle: Of the nature and State of Man, with respect to Society. (Brockes (1740), 58–85)

p. 58. 'See, plastic Nature working to this end, / The single atoms each to other tend, Attract, attracted to, the next in place, form'd and impell'd, its neighbour to embrace. / See matter next, with various life endu'd, / Press to one centre, still, the gen'ral good'.²⁰

It has only recently been recognised (Brandt (2007)) that these quotations are in no way arbitrarily chosen as poetical adornments for the decoration of a serious scientific pursuit, but rather express a basic agreement with the central goals of the four-part 'Essay on Man', which is likewise to be attributed to British physico-theology (Waschkies (1987)).²¹ In any event, the surviving notes of the young Kant on a prize essay²² of the francophone Berlin (that is, Prussian) Académie royale des sciences et belles lettres plainly bear the marks of Pope's influence.²³ In two other early works as well Kant refers approvingly to Pope's essay.²⁴

Geschöpf, dergleichen möglich, zu geschehn, / Und sahen unsern Newton an, so wie wir einen Affen sehn' (AN 1:360; Brockes (1740), 35).

²⁰ 'Schau sich die bildende Natur zu ihrem großen Zweck bewegen, / Ein jedes Sonnenstäubchen sich, nach einem andern Stäubchen, regen, / Ein jedes, das gezogen wird, ein anders wieder an sich ziehn, / Das nächste wieder zu umfassen, es zu formieren sich bemühen. / Beschau die Materie auf tausend Art und Weise sich / Zum allgemeinen Centro drängen, ihr allgemeines Gut' (AN 1:259; Brockes (1740), 59).

²¹ See also Kreimendahl and Oberhausen in their edition of *Der einzig mögliche Beweisgrund zu einer Demonstration des Daseins Gottes* (Kant (2011), especially xxxii–xlii and 221–3).

²² The beginning of the prize question reads, 'We ask for an examination of Pope's system as contained in the proposition "all is right"' ('On demande l'examen du système de Pope contenu dans la proposition: Tout est bien'), cited by Lessing (1972), 787. For understanding Kant's intentions at this this early stage, Mendelsohn and Lessing's *Pope ein Metaphysiker*, anonymously published in Danzig in 1755, is indispensable. The prize essay of the academy aims for a critique of 'optimism' after Leibniz's 1710 *Theodizee*.

²³ *Handschriftlicher Nachlaß* 17:229–39, R 3703, 3704, 3705 (α^1 /1753–4). The first of these reflections contains, according to the editor Erich Adickes, 'a reproduction of the train of thought of the fourth epistle of Al. Pope's Essay on Man (from roughly the 75th verse)' (17:229; my translation). See also Brandt (2007), 200–2.

²⁴ *Gedanken bei dem frühzeitigen Ableben des Hochwohlgebornen Herrn, Herrn Johann Friedrich von Funk* (1760) (2:042); Brockes (1740), 10–11: 'That each may fill the circle mark'd by heav'n' ('Daß jeder seinen Kreis vollende, den ihm der Himmel ausersehn'). *The Only Possible Argument in Support of a Demonstration of the Existence of God* (1763) (Em 2:137); Brockes (1740), 34–5: 'Go, teach Eternal Wisdom how to rule – then drop into thy-self, and be a fool!' ('Geh, schreibe Gottes ewger Weisheit des Regiments Regeln vor, / Denn kehre wieder in dich selbst zuletzt zurück, und sey ein Thor!'). Kant's high opinion of the *Essay on Man* persists into the *Anthropology*, but here, if I understand the matter, it only applies to the poetry and the poet himself. Thus in the Friedländer notes, we find the following: 'However, to bring virtue and its sensations into a harmonious play is meritorious, for it is something intellectual, and to make this intuitable is truly meritorious, for example Pope's *Essay on Man*' (VA-Friedländer 25:527). Further mentions of Alexander Pope can be found in the following lectures: 25:121, 137, 190, 202, 345, 399, 455, 1059, 1178, 1190, 1232, 1265, 1378. See also A 7:210, 267, 305.

The view of the human being associated with physical theology does, however, offer a striking contrast to the alternative 'determination of man' formulated from the beginning in the lectures on anthropology. As quoted in the first letter, in Pope the human being appears as a link in a long chain of divine creatures, placed in between the higher angels and the lower cattle (i.e. other animals). This is more pronounced in Albert Haller's 1734 poem 'On the origin of evil':

Our mortal race, far below these celestial spirits, partakes equally of divinity and baseness: composed of two different natures, destined partly to immortality / partly to corruption, man holds an equivocal rank between brute and angel. He dies, he survives himself. (Haller (1794), 95–6)²⁵

While the physical-theologian wishes to direct his gaze upwards, to the higher beings, Kant – with Rousseau – turns his gaze below. Instead of comparing the human being to an angel, Kant's comparison is with an animal for which human experience is a mere possibility. Collins formulates this with clear reference to the physico-theological context right from the beginning:

If one were to remove reason from the human being, then the question is: What sort of animal would the human being then be? He certainly might not be the last one, but his animality, since it is moderated by the human soul, is hard to recognise; for who knows what kind of animality the Deity mixes with reason in order to make a human being. (VA-Collins 25:14)²⁶

²⁵ Kant probably used Haller (1751). Kant continues to refer to such a physico-theologically construed 'intermediate thing' (*Mittelding*) between God and Man with sceptical and ironic distance in his *Doctrine of Virtue* (MS 6:461 ff). Seen in this way, it seems likely that Pope or Haller is among those who 'would introduce', according to the *Critique of Pure Reason*, 'that intermediate thing between matter and thinking beings' (KrV A222/B270). According to Warda, Kant was in possession of a German translation of the *Système de la nature* by Pierre Louis Moreau de Maupertuis: *Versuch von der Bildung der Körper* (1761) (Warda (1922), 29). The anonymous translator cites Haller with the following words: 'Ill-fated thing between Angels and Brutes / So proud of your reason, yet never do you use it' (my translation, p. 54: 'Unselig Mittelding von Engeln und vom Vieh! / Du prahlst mit der Vernunft, und du gebrauchst sie nie').

²⁶ See also 'This is an important item about which many authors have already ventured to write, among whom Rousseau is the most distinguished. What should one in fact judge about humanity? Among the animals, and among all beings, what [kind of] a character does it have? How much good and how much evil is in it? Does he contain a source for evil, or for good, in himself? In the first place, the human being must be characterised as an animal. Linné says that, upon all reflection, he finds nothing special about the human being as an animal; hence he must also put him in one class with the ape. If one also wanted to infer the character from this, then it would be very bad, for the apes are very malevolent and deceitful animals. Here, however, we are comparing the human being with all animals in general, and so first of all we ask: if the human being were in a savage state, and had no use of reason, what [sort of] animal would he in fact be there?' (VA-Friedländer 25:675). Even in the final version of his *Anthropology*, Kant refers explicitly to Rousseau regarding this question (see A 7:324).

Parow's account from 1772–3 reads as follows:

Because man is an animal that must be disciplined, and which grows up without discipline, he is not dissimilar to a wild animal. Rousseau made a mistake when he thought that discipline sprang from the nature of man. (VA-Parow 25:447; Joshua Mendelsohn's translation)²⁷

In other words, the human being is a creature that needs to be educated. Nature alone (i.e. a divine creator) does not make him into what he, with the help of education, can be and become. With this new impulse, Kant shows not only that he is, as I have shown elsewhere (Stark 2012, 2014), an immediate successor of the Genevan Jean-Jacques Rousseau, but rather also that he has embarked on the long road of empirical observation of the human being and human beings. We have before us an echo of this readings-based empirical study, largely preserved in the student accounts of his lectures on anthropology.

²⁷ Similarly, 'Man is an animal that must be disciplined' (VA-Parow 25:425). This prefiguration, which is not picked up in VA-Parow 25:426 (editor's note #236) may refer to the quoted passage on p. 325. This 'investigation of passions' is in fact continued, however, with the intention of effecting a positive change – the formation of a morally founded character through education. In the following years, this fundamental thesis is repeated with only minor variations, finally being suggested in the *Anthropology* (A 7:267). See also the *Handschriftlichen Nachlaß* 15:533, 647, 652, 766, as well as VA-Friedländer 25:582, 643, VA-Pillau 25:814 f, *Menschenkunde* 25:1146, 1170, VA-Mrongovius 25:1385, and VA-Busolt 25:1516.

*Self-cognition and self-assessment**Rudolf A. Makkreel*

Kant lectured on anthropology from 1772 until his retirement in 1796. Now that some of these lectures as recorded by students have become available – first in the 1997 Academy edition, Volumes 25.1 and 25.2, and then in the Cambridge translation edition of 2012 – it is also possible to understand more adequately the final 1798 version that Kant allowed to be published as his *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*. Some of the earlier lectures give more detailed examples to support his views about human nature. There are many positions that Kant holds throughout, but there are also shifts of emphasis that show a certain development in his thinking.

In some of the lecture courses on anthropology Kant seems confident that we can intuit ourselves. In the earliest *Collins* lectures of 1772–3 he espouses the view that we can intuit ourselves in a non-phenomenal way: ‘We have no intuition in the whole world except the intuition of our self; all other things are appearances’ (VA-*Collins* 25:14). The *Friedländer* and *Pillau* lectures, from the 1770s as well, also mention our ability to intuit ourselves. But subsequently Kant goes to great lengths to stress the difficulties of observing oneself as one is. The alternative that is proposed is to cognise oneself in terms of what one can make of oneself in the world.

The overall aim of this chapter will be to explore Kant’s views on our cognitive faculties to establish what, if anything, can be done to compensate for the limits of introspective self-observation. In considering how we can become aware of ourselves, three approaches will be examined: (1) that of inner sense at the level of the soul animating the body, (2) that of the interior sense at the level of our state of mind and (3) that of apperception at the level of intellect and spirit. I will argue that the second and third approaches to self-cognition replace self-observation with self-assessment. To point to what is distinctive about the interior sense that is introduced in the final *Anthropology*, Kant’s discussions of the cognitive faculties in various versions of the anthropology ranging from 1772 to 1798 will be examined.

1. The problematic nature of inner sense

Inner sense is what one would expect to turn to in order to ascertain what is going on in the human psyche. This is certainly the impression Kant gives in the preamble of the extensive *Friedländer Lectures* of 1775–6. There we read, ‘The world as an object of outer sense is nature, the world as an object of inner sense is the human being’ (VA-*Friedländer* 25:469). In these lectures inner sense is conceived simply as our capacity to intuit ourselves. It is not suspected of being unreliable, but attentiveness to it is said to be ‘wearisome and forcible, although it is necessary for re-examination; it only must not be continuous’ (VA-*Friedländer* 25:492). The Mrongovius lectures of 1784–5 do begin to cast doubt on inner sense by speaking of its delusional sensations (see VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1256). This reflects Kant’s position in the *Critique of Pure Reason* that inner sense is purely phenomenal and should not be confused with apperceptive self-consciousness. This position is more fully acknowledged in the final *Anthropology*, where the ‘passivity of the inner sense of sensations’ (A 7:142) is dismissed as only being relevant to psychology, not to philosophical and anthropological reflection.

Since outer sense gives human beings access to the world around them, it is inner sense that empirical psychologists have turned to for access to their subject matter. One of the problems Kant has with inner sense is that it offers a stream of obscure rather than clear representations. Sometimes Kant speaks of obscure (*dunkle*) representations as being in the shade, as it were, so that we can only be dimly aware of them, and sometimes as those we are not conscious of. What is given in inner sense need not, however, be unconscious because ‘we can still be *indirectly* conscious of having a representation, even if we are not directly conscious of it’ (A 7:135). There are also representations of outer sense that are obscure but they can more readily be referred to external objects that have spatial determinacy. The *Anthropology* expands on this by describing the obscure representations in the human being as an immense field of which only a few points are clear: ‘only a few places on the vast *map* of our mind are *illuminated*’ (A 7:135, original emphasis). This indicates that the field of obscure representations can be regarded as the vague horizon within which some clear representations can be fixed. A clear representation is defined as one that is able to distinguish one object from another and therefore must already belong to outer sense. The representations of inner sense cannot be made clear and determinately fixed. They constitute an indeterminate temporal stream, or, as the final text reads, ‘inner sense sees the relations

of its determinations only in time, hence in flux, where the stability of observation necessary for experience does not occur' (A 7:134).

Introspection as the attempt to observe this flux of inner sense is difficult because it interferes with the phenomenal play of sensations. In the *Friedländer Lectures* Kant notes that self-observation is more arduous than the observation of things in the external world and should only be done rarely. Then referring to a human being who wants to study himself, Kant asserts in the *Menschenkunde* of 1781–2 that 'when the incentives are active, he does not observe them . . . But if he does observe himself, then all of the incentives are at rest and he has nothing to observe' (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:857). This language about the difficulties of self-observation is almost identical to that of the final *Anthropology* (see A 7:121). In the latter, the limits of observing others are discussed as well:

If a human being notices that someone is observing him and trying to study him, he will either appear embarrassed (self-conscious) and cannot show himself as he really is; or he dissembles, and does not want to be known as he is. (A 7:121)

What is left as a more reasonable alternative to human self-observation (*Beobachtung*) is a less explicit taking note (*Bemerkung*) of oneself. But our ability to take note of inner sense must be kept within limits. To dwell in any way on these obscure representations of inner sense is to subject ourselves to an overwhelming play of sensations. This is unhealthy and leads to hypochondria. From early on Kant indicates that one should not attend to one's *person*, as the hypochondriac does, but to one's *activities* in engaging others and the world around us (see VA-*Collins* 25:23). This means, then, that empirical psychology, which studies the soul as the sphere of inner sense, is a suspect science. By replacing empirical psychology with his own anthropology, Kant makes it clear that we should not study the soul by itself. He notes that the soul is sometimes regarded as the organ of inner sense just as the ear and eyes are organs of outer sense. But to make this comparison with other bodily organs threatens to transform psychology into a physiological anthropology. What Kant is proposing instead is an anthropology that correlates the soul with mind and spirit. The important thing is to not focus on the idea of the soul as such.

2. Developing soul into mind and spirit

Rational metaphysics has posited the soul as an ideal immortal substance that is distinct from material substance. Empirical psychology in the

eighteenth century regarded the soul as the locus of certain capacities of the human being as a living animate being. Kant used the 'Psychologia empirica' of Alexander Baumgarten's *Metaphysica* as the text for his lectures on anthropology, and the early lectures reflect this by making more references to the soul than do the later ones. In the final published version of the *Anthropology* Kant says that he will 'abstract from the question whether the human being has a soul or not (as a special incorporeal substance)' (A 7:161). Accordingly, he refers to the soul only in passing as the so-called organ of inner sense.

The early Collins notes relate the soul to mind and spirit as part of a discussion about our capacities (*Fähigkeiten*) and their development into faculties (*Vermögen*) and powers (*Kräfte*) (see VA-Collins 25:15). A capacity need not be active, and that is what the soul turns out to be. The relevant passage in the Collins notes is very instructive and worth quoting in full:

The capacity to be modified, or to be passive, one calls the lower power of the soul; the capacity to act self-actively is the higher power. Insofar as the soul is capable of impressions that the body suffers passively it is called *anima*, but insofar as it is capable of self-active action, it is called *mens*. Insofar as both are united and the former capacity stands under the moderating influence of the other, it is called *animus*. *Anima* is called 'soul', *animus* 'mind', *mens* 'spirit'. These are not three substances but three ways we feel ourselves living. In regard to the first way we are passive, in regard to the other, passive but simultaneously reactive, in regard to the third way we are entirely self-active. (VA-Collins 25:16)

There is a broad sense of soul that encompasses all three ways or levels of being alive, but strictly speaking 'soul' (*Seele*) stands for the mere passive capacity to be affected by sense. The intermediate level of mind (*Gemüth*) is more important because it allows us to become active, even if only in a reactive way. In co-operation with spirit (*Geist*), mind can also become self-active. The traditional concept of soul is in effect reduced to the level of mere animate life and spirit needs to be recognised as the principle of mental life or of being self-active or spontaneous. To dwell on the contents of inner sense provided by the soul is to be passive. The purpose of anthropology from a pragmatic point of view is to make us active participants in the world. We must move from the obscure field of inner sense and turn our attention to outer sense.

Indeed, in conjunction with outer sense the flux of inner sense could be illuminated. But Kant is not really interested in fleshing out the indeterminate field of inner sense into a more determinate territory of inner

experience by correlating it with outer sense as the source of outer experience. Nevertheless, he could be seen as providing the tools for this in the *Friedländer Lectures* by the manner in which he distinguishes between the objective and subjective aspects of sense: intuition (*Anschauung*) and sensation (*Empfindung*) (see VA-Friedländer 25:493). The senses of intuition are touch, sight and hearing; those of sensation are smell and taste:

The senses of intuition are objective, those of sensation are subjective. The former present objects to us, the others consist in the way in which we are affected by them. For example, when seeing I perceive objects, but when smelling, I have a sensation of an impression. (VA-Friedländer 25:493)

These are all outer senses, but some of them make a direct impression on our own state of being. On this basis it could be argued that we can have inner experiences that need not be obscure if they can be correlated with outer experience. Indeed, the defining feature of Wilhelm Dilthey's effort to replace the Kantian conception of experience (*Erfahrung*) with that of lived experience (*Erlebnis*) is to bring the inner and the outer closer together. Dilthey gives an example of an inner experience that is both emotional and directed at the external world: he speaks of looking at the picture of Goethe in his study, but calls it an inner experience because it reminds him of the fact that it used to hang in his father's house and that it was given to him. This outer experience of a picture on the wall in his study becomes an inner experience to the extent that it recalls the past and arouses emotions and brings about a kind of self-awareness. Although Dilthey also recognises the difficulties of introspection because any act of attentive observation tends to interrupt the activities of the mind, he attaches much more importance to the way consciousness can both attend to something outside it and still take note of itself. Even when I am totally absorbed by what I see around me, it is always still possible to become aware that I am having this lived experience. To be sure, this is merely an implicit awareness that is reflexively self-referential. Reflexive awareness¹ is not yet the explicit and reflective self-consciousness of the 'I think' that Kant assigns to the understanding.² But like Kant's reflective 'I think', Dilthey's reflexive awareness is in principle 'able to accompany all my representations' (KrV B131) without relying on introspection.

¹ 'Reflexive awareness' is a translation of *Innewerden* and denotes a pre-reflective sense of what is possessed in consciousness. See Dilthey (1989), 247–63.

² For further explication of reflexive awareness as a quasi-transcendental condition of experience, see Makkreel (1992), 'Afterword to the Second Expanded Edition', 428–34.

Because Kant regards the soul as the organ of inner sense and looks to the body for the organs of outer sense, he creates an inner–outer dichotomy that is too sharp. Even the so-called objective outer sense of sight can affect us if the impressions are too intense, as when we have been surrounded by bright lights that induce a headache. This surely can have an effect on our state of being, even if only temporarily. However, Kant's pragmatic anthropology aims to abstract as much as possible from such states and to focus instead on how we take command of them. This is perhaps most clear in the *Anthropology Parow* of 1772–3, where we read:

Insofar as the soul is thought of in combination with the body and cannot prevent what affects the senses from being communicated to it, it is soul, and there it is merely passive. But insofar as the soul reacts to sensible impressions and proves itself active it is *animus*, and to the extent that it is entirely independent of all sensibility and represents something it is *mens*. (VA-Parow 25:247)

These Parow notes confirm Kant's shift away from thinking of the soul in the broad metaphysical sense in order to assign it a more narrow sense as passively inhering in the body. This means that a physical pain affecting the soul (*Seele*) in the passive sense (*anima*) can nevertheless be reacted to by the mind (*Gemüth*) as active (*animus*). By adopting a state of mind, I respond to the pain that the soul suffers in terms of an attitude. I can dwell on the pain and feel sorry for myself or I can try to ignore the pain as much as possible. To truly rise above the pain requires an act of spirit (*mens*), which is self-active and independent of all sensibility. At this third level, that of spirit (*Geist*), my attitude comes under the control of my free will, making me capable of adopting the Stoic ideal of being in possession of myself (*Selbstbesitz*). Kant concludes that 'the soul can be swimming entirely in pain, and yet in the spirit there can be great gladness' (VA-Collins 25:17).

To be in possession of oneself from this Stoic standpoint is not to dwell on the contents of inner sense or even the resulting state of mind, but to rise to the serene level of spiritual composure. The Stoics arrived at this serenity through their principle of apathy. I do not think, however, that Kant wants to adopt the Stoic attitude of apathy wholesale, mainly because it is too negative. It involves the activity of abstraction, which, although important according to Kant, is not yet a positive attitude. He starts out by endorsing the principle of apathy as correct, but later qualifies that endorsement.

In the published 1798 version of the *Anthropology*, we read initially that 'the principle of *apathy* – namely that the wise man must never be in a

state of affect, not even that of compassion with the misfortune of his best friend – is an entirely correct and sublime moral principle of the Stoic school; for affect makes us (more or less) blind' (A 7:253).

Kant is willing to acknowledge that an affect is a sudden feeling that disrupts the mind's composure and tends to stand in the way of reflection. Affects are not reliable guides for morality, but they are not always bad. Kant gives an illuminating contrast between the affect of anger and the passion of hatred. Anger is a sudden natural affect and often quickly forgotten. But when it turns into the hatred of something it becomes a destructive passion that lasts. An affect is compared to '*drunkenness* that one sleeps off', whereas passion is like '*dementia* that broods over a representation which nestles itself deeper and deeper' (A 7:253). Affects are like temporary aberrations that one can get over, and they can even be put to good use. Enthusiasm is an instance of an affect that can be of value when it is allied with reason. The feeling of sublimity is such an affect: it stimulates the mind and can provide us an instantaneous glimpse of the noumenal. What is dangerous is fanaticism, which is the demented passionate extension of enthusiasm and leads to dogmatism.

Returning to the Stoic principle of apathy that discourages affects such as compassion, we can see Kant qualify his support of its correctness when he adds: 'nevertheless, the wisdom of nature has planted in us the predisposition to compassion in order to handle the reins *provisionally*, until reason has achieved the necessary strength' (A 7:253, original emphasis). An action will not be moral unless it is based on a rational principle, but we should not be inhibited from using feelings such as compassion and enthusiasm to 'produce an enlivening of the will (in spiritual or political speeches to the people, or even in solitary speeches to oneself)' to create 'the preliminary resolve [*Vorsatz*] to do good' (A 7:254; my translation). To be sure, once reason causes the enthusiasm of such a resolve, it must be attributed to the faculty of desire and no longer to affect as feeling.

Ultimately Kant classifies apathy as a 'fortunate phlegm' that some have as the natural endowment of the phlegmatic temperament. This natural temperament may make the transition to acting on principle easier, but it is hardly a moral achievement. For, as Kant indicated in the *Friedländer Lectures*, temperament is merely 'the proportion of feelings and desires' that we inherit. 'With temperament we do not act according to principles and dispositions as with character, but according to inclinations' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:636). What Kant aims for in his philosophy is the transformation of a natural temperament such as apathy into the development of character as a second nature.

The importance of character for Kant's moral philosophy will be discussed later, but for the moment I propose that apathy at the level of the soul can be improved upon at the level of the mind with what Kant calls 'equanimity' (*Gleichmüthigkeit*) in the *Mrongovius Lectures*: 'Equanimity is the firmness of our mental disposition' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1320) that is to be distinguished from the 'indifference [*Gleichgültigkeit*] [which] comes from temperament' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1319). Equanimity does not leave us apathetic or unconcerned about what is happening to us and the world around us, but it involves a composure that keeps us from lashing out unthinkingly: 'to be equanimous one needs only to consider that nothing in our life is as important as our good conduct alone . . . The equanimous person always has a cheerful heart and that is the pleasure that Epicurus praises' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1320). Stoic apathy can be replaced with Epicurean equanimity.

3. Appropriate ways of attending to oneself

As was indicated at the outset, anthropology from the pragmatic point of view is not about what nature has made of a human being, but about 'what *he* as a free-acting being makes of himself, or can and should make of himself' (A 7:119, original emphasis). This means that instead of introspecting, human beings should be engaged in the world and learn what is required to become a citizen of the world. Although Kant shares the cosmopolitanism of the Stoics and their ideals of peace and wisdom, he differs from the Stoics in not advocating disengagement from political life. Apathy towards others is not the answer. Anthropology must study human beings as both engaged in the world at large and in relation to each other up close. Pragmatic anthropology is not a theoretical discipline, but a prudential one. As the term 'pragmatic' is introduced in the *Friedländer Lectures*, it is said to consist 'in the power of judgment to avail ourselves of all skill' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:469). In the final *Anthropology* we read that pragmatic anthropology is not concerned with *knowing* the world, but with what it means 'to *have* the world' (A 7:120, original emphasis). The former involves understanding what is at play in the world, the latter teaches how to be a co-player in the world (see A 7:120). The Kantian watchwords here are co-operation (*mitspielen*) and participation (*Teilnehmung*); both require active engagement.

It is this shift from theoretical philosophy in the academic sense (*nach dem Schulbegriff*) to practical philosophy in the worldly sense (*nach dem Weltbegriff*) that needs to be made before a concern with self-consciousness

can be approved. We already pointed out that introspection, or observing oneself in isolation from others, is dangerous according to Kant. Any intense focus on inner sense can lead to egoism, hypochondria, and even madness. The alternative to observation that Kant proposes is a less intense 'taking note of [*bemerken*]' and 'attending to [*aufmerken*] oneself', which become necessary 'when one is dealing with others' (A 7:131; my translation). I propose that it is possible to make a distinction here between an explicit *self-consciousness* that is theoretically suspect and an implicit *self-awareness* that is practically necessary. It is this mere self-awareness that is to be developed by means of a pragmatic anthropology, and its proper cultivation requires tact. This becomes evident right away because he warns that 'in social interchange, it [attending to self] must not become visible; for then it makes conversation either *embarrassed* (awkward [*verlegen*]) or *affected* (stilted)' (A 7:132, original emphasis; my translation). Attending to the self must be adjusted in accordance with one's social context and should not have to rise to the level of attentive self-observation.

Whereas psychology is a theoretical discipline interested in describing *inner sense*, pragmatic anthropology is not. Kant is not aiming at 'a description of human beings, but of human nature' (VA-Friedländer 25:471). Explicit self-consciousness is only appropriate at the level of apperception and as an index to human nature in general. Thus Kant's advice not to bother observing the involuntary representations that come to us unbidden does not mean that we should not at times observe the cognitive *activities* involved in representing the world. Indeed we read that 'to observe the various acts of representative power in myself, *when I summon them*, is indeed worth reflection; it is necessary and useful for logic and metaphysics' (A 7:133; italics added). I must take notice of how the cognitive powers function and learn their scope and limits. Anthropology has relevance to what was called 'applied general logic' in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. There Kant wrote that this applied logic is 'a representation of the understanding and the rules of its necessary use *in concreto*, namely under the contingent conditions of the subject, which can hinder or promote this use . . . It deals with attention, its hindrance and consequences, the cause of error' (KrV A54/B78–79). The main use of applied general logic is negative, by pinpointing sources of fallacious reasoning, and it is therefore called 'a cathartic of the common understanding' (KrV A53/B78). He makes a comparison between this kind of applied logic and the doctrine of virtue, which assesses the laws of morality relative to 'the hindrances of the feelings, inclinations, and passions to which human beings are more or less subject' (KrV A55/B79). We can thus think of pragmatic anthropology as

a theory of education that teaches us to be aware both of the weaknesses of the cognitive faculties standing in the way of a healthy understanding and of the hindrances that our inclinations and passions pose for moral action. Indeed the concluding section of *Friedländer* is entitled 'On Education' (see VA-*Friedländer* 25:722–8).

Kant examines the cognitive, affective and volitional powers of human beings to judge how much each of them can contribute to their development and to what extent they should be cultivated. Obviously the higher faculty of apperception that constitutes thinking should be cultivated more than the lower perceptive powers of sense. The I of apperception that unites our representations and makes cognition possible contains no content. The function of apperceptive self-consciousness is not to introspect what is given in inner sense, but to provide the rules of unification for experiencing the world around us. Kant sums this up in the *Anthropology* as follows: 'The "I" of reflection contains no manifold in itself and is always one and the same in every judgment, because it is merely the formal element of consciousness' (A 7:141). This I is the transcendental unity of apperception and functions at the level of what is called spirit in the anthropology lectures.

Even though the senses are passive and part of the lower cognitive faculty, they are not to be despised if they are placed under the control of the I of apperception and its spontaneity. The senses provide the material for the formal functions of the understanding. Thus Kant provides an apology of sensibility over against the rationalists by arguing that the senses do not confuse or deceive. Confusions and deceptions derive from incorrect ways of relating representations of sense. These are errors of judgment, not errors of sense.

Nevertheless, the senses may produce misleading semblances.³ This can be in the way either of creating an illusion or of actually deceiving us. There are many natural optical illusions that cannot be avoided, yet they need not deceive the understanding. In the *Critique of Pure Reason* Kant gives the example that 'the sea appears higher in the middle than at the shores' (KrV A297/B354). Yet the understanding knows that this is not really the case, so we learn not to be fooled by this illusion produced by light rays. But having earlier said that the senses as such do not deceive, Kant goes on to mention that sometimes a sensory illusion (*Sinnenschein*) may be deceptive. This is initially confusing, but the example Kant gives

³ The Cambridge translation of the *Anthropology* renders Kant's term *Blendwerk* as 'delusion'. I will instead follow the translation of the *Critique of Pure Reason* and translate it as 'semblance'. Delusion comes too close to deception and is not an adequate covering term to encompass illusion.

of a deception of the senses is the use of make-up. The senses can be said to be deceived by those who apply make-up to cover facial blemishes such as wrinkles. It is artifice that creates the semblance of smooth unblemished skin. Kant fails to point out that the smooth facial surface that is seen is really there, it just isn't the natural skin we normally expect to see. The deception is not really sensuous, for it results from faulty assumptions. Another kind of artificial semblance is called 'bewitchment', which can be caused by the passion of love. With bewitchment the imagination seems to be a contributing factor.

Kant follows the section on sensible illusion with one on 'moral illusion' (A 7:151). Here he argues that a part of being a civilised human being is to 'adopt the illusion [*Schein*] of affection, of respect for others, of modesty, and of unselfishness without deceiving anyone at all' (A 7:151). These are artificial forms of politeness that make it easier to deal with other people. Bowing and courtly gallantry are part of the decorum of Kant's day that may seem insincere to us. But Kant thinks that no one expects such sensible signs of politeness to be sincere and that the semblance of benevolence and respect evoked by them may eventually produce the real thing. Whereas make-up is considered deplorable because it is used to make oneself seem better than one is, certain forms of flattery seem to be acceptable because they make others seem superior.

When Kant goes on to consider what our senses can teach us, he makes it clear that sensibility also includes the power of the imagination (*Einbildungskraft*). The senses provide intuition in the presence of objects, the imagination without their presence. We already saw that the intuitive content of sense may not be directly conscious. When that content becomes conscious it 'is called *sensation*, especially when the sensation at the same time arouses the subject's attention to his own state' (A 7:153, original emphasis). We noted earlier that in the *Friedländer Lectures* of 1775–6, Kant distinguished between the objective senses of sight, hearing and touch that are intuitive and the subjective senses of smell and taste that provide us with sensory impressions. In the 1798 published lectures these senses are distinguished less sharply, in terms of degree, namely as more or less objective. Moreover, we find a new distinction between organic (organ-based) and vital sensations that was introduced in the *Anthropologie Mrongovius* of 1784–5 (see VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1242). The organic senses are the five outer senses already referred to. The most objective sense of sight affects the nerves of the eye as a sense organ just as the most subjective sense of smell affects the nerves of the nose. Vital sensations and vital sense are more difficult to define.

4. Vital sense, interior sense and self-assessment

Vital sensations are different in that they affect the whole body. In *Mrongovius* we read that ‘through the vital sense the entire nervous system is vibrated as for example with horror, which is elicited by ideas as well as outer objects’ (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1242). The final *Anthropology* elaborates as follows:

Sensations of warm and cold, even those that are aroused by the mind (for example, by quickly rising hope or fear), belong to *vital sensation*. The *shudder* that seizes the human being himself at the representation of the sublime, and the *horror* with which nurses’ tales drive children to bed late at night, belong to vital sensation; they penetrate the body as far as there is life in it. (A 7:154, original emphasis; my translation)

What distinguishes vital sensations is that they can leave their mark, not in ‘inner sense’ (*innerer Sinn* = *sensus internus*) but in what Kant calls our ‘interior sense’ (*inwendiger Sinn* = *sensus interior*) (A 7:153). Interior sense has to do with ‘the feeling of pleasure and displeasure; that is, the receptivity of the subject to be determined by certain representations to *preserve or reject the state of those representations*’ (A 7:153, added emphasis; my translation). What is of anthropological interest concerning vital sensations, in the case of both the merely physiological state of being hot and the mental state of fear, is the capacity of interior sense to assess what to do about them. Assuming that these states are felt to be unpleasant, we want to take action to be released from their hold on us. The interior sense is the capacity to preserve or reject a state of mind. Whereas inner sense is receptive, the interior sense can be said to be responsive.

We have pointed to some similarities between a bodily vital sense and a mental interior sense. However, it should be noted that whereas the vital sense was anticipated in *Mrongovius*, the interior sense was not. Kant does not seem to have developed this late concept of the interior sense, but its introduction sheds light on how we should attend to ourselves. When we attend to inner sense, we think of the life of consciousness in terms of representational *contents* that are obscure and readily distorted by our imagination. But there is a pragmatic way of thinking about the life of consciousness in terms of *states of mind* that reflect how we assess things. I propose that Kant’s notion of an interior sense initiates that function and signals the transition to the idea that self-cognition is not a project of self-description but of self-assessment. The interior sense of §15 provides a felt-assessment of our overall state of mind just as the vital sense is said to register our overall bodily state in §16.

Then beginning with §17 the organic senses are assessed. Kant starts with touch (*Betastung*) as providing direct external perception, which makes it 'the most important and most reliably instructive' sense (A 7:155). Its use lies in immediately informing us of the shape of objects and provides the basis for the mediate objective senses of hearing and sight as sources of cognition. Touch is considered purely in terms of its objective spatial import. How an object 'feels' (*anzufühlen sei*) (A 7:155) – that is, whether its surface is smooth or rough, warm or cold, which would be of interest to vital sense – is not considered relevant here and must be abstracted from.

Hearing contributes nothing to further determining the shape or spatial determinacy of objects, but because the sounds we utter through language do not directly point to objects, they are considered to be 'the best means of designating concepts' (A 7:155). The use of articulated sounds in speech allows us to reason with others about how we represent objects in order to conceptually define their rule-bound behaviour. But when we listen to sounds in terms of their tonal qualities, then we have music that moves our vital sense. Music is defined as 'a language of sheer sensations (without any concepts)' that allows 'a communication of feelings at a distance to all present within the surrounding space' (A 7:155).

Sight is a sense of mediate sensation, as was hearing. Its importance lies in its capacity to discern matter in motion – not just in the space of touch, but also in time of hearing. Sight is evaluated as the noblest sense because it has the widest spatial scope and represents objects as intuitively as possible with the least admixture of self-feeling. In other words, sight allows us to forget about ourselves – in terms of both the obscure contents of inner sense and the interior state of our feelings – and be absorbed in the world around us.

Kant does not skip over the more subjective senses of taste and smell. Whereas the first three organ-based senses rely on mechanical influence, these last two organ-based senses of taste and smell involve chemical influence and can strongly affect our sense of pleasure and displeasure. Smell is the one sense that it does not pay to cultivate because 'there are more disgusting objects than pleasant ones' (A 7:158). Yet we cannot dispense with it because it can warn us of dangerous gases and fumes. Taste can warn of spoiled food but it 'also has the specific advantage of promoting sociability in eating and drinking, something the sense of smell does not do' (A 7:159).

However, even the noblest sense of sight may affect the interior sense, as Kant admits when he speaks of how 'in the strongest light we *see* (distinguish) nothing' (A 7:158, original emphasis). This is a case of feeling ourselves being frustrated by the sense of sight rather than clearly seeing the

objects before us. Thus Kant concludes, 'given the same degree of influence on them, the senses *teach* less the more strongly they feel themselves being *affected*' (A 7:158, original emphasis).

The following paragraph confirms that even the most objective organ-based senses may affect our state of well-being, and, if they do, it is indirectly by way of the vital sense:

The more susceptible to impressions the vital sense is (the more tender and sensitive), the more unfortunate the human being is; on the other hand, the more susceptible he is toward the organ-based sense (sensitive) and the more inured to the vital sense, the more fortunate he is – I say more fortunate, not exactly morally better – for he has the feeling of his own well-being more under his control. (A 7:158)

Our fortune depends on not allowing the interior sense to be unduly swayed by the vital sense as it is affected either by general conditions like heat or by overly stimulated organs of sense. A person who does not let the intensity of sense impressions affect his sense of well-being is strong enough to develop a 'delicate sensitivity', but one who cannot 'withstand satisfactorily the penetration of influences on the senses into consciousness – that is, attending to them against his will' – is condemned to a weak or 'tender sensitivity' (A 7:158).

Delicate sensitivity, which is good, involves discernment about what surrounds us by focusing on the details of what the organ-based senses teach us about the world and being willing to face any negative effects on our vital sense. At the level of interior sense, one could choose to abstract from these negative effects as much as possible, not unlike the way Kant suggested in *Collins* that we should move from the passive level of mere soul to the responsive level of mind and the self-activating or spontaneous level of spirit.⁴ Of course the senses can also have a pleasant enlivening effect on our vital sense and then we naturally wish to preserve it rather than overcome it. If the felt pleasure reaches a reflective level and puts our cognitive faculties in a purposive harmony, then the positive assessment of it at the level of interior sense can be affirmed at the level of judgment.

What characterises tender, as distinct from delicate, sensitivity is the inability to abstract from the negative effects that the vital sense can have on us. Tender souls would seek out what is pleasant and avoid what is challenging or threatening in any way. In matters of taste they would opt for easy beauty and stay clear of the sublime. Tender sensitivity is sensibility in retreat. It is the reluctance to suffer the potential negative effects on the

⁴ 'Mind' (*Gemüth*) should be conceived as the 'mental feeling' of interior sense and should not be equated with 'intellect' (*Verstand*), which functions at the level of spirit.

vital sense and the incapacity to properly respond to them through the interior sense.

The vital sense indicates our overall state of being apart from our control whereas the interior sense as I am elaborating it here would signal the ability to take control through self-assessment. Kant's account of the sublime allows us to further refine this proposed relation between the vital sense and the interior sense. We already saw Kant associate the sublime with how the vital sense can make our bodies shudder with terror. In the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, the sublime was shown to be either physically terrifying or imaginatively challenging, with the possibility of obtaining pleasurable relief through the realisation that we are more than natural beings. As natural beings, we feel that our life is somehow threatened by overpowering mountains and violent storms, but once we remind ourselves that we are also rational beings we recognise that we possess a more fundamental power to improve our life rather than merely to preserve it. The sublime is an emotional state of being stirred (*Rührung*), namely 'a subjective movement of the imagination, by which it *does violence to the inner sense*' (KU 5:259; italics added) and the way it temporally orders representational contents. When we confront something overwhelming, the ordinary way of apprehending things progressively in time must be reversed by 'a regression' that comprehends things in 'one instantaneous moment' (*Augenblick*) (KU 5:258; my translation). This instant is not part of the linear flux of time, but constitutes a limit point of time.⁵ It discloses a state of mind that is felt to be simultaneously displeasurable and pleasurable. The violence done by the sublime to the time of *inner* sense and the displeasure of the vital sense can prompt us to pause and plumb our *interior* sense to find aesthetic relief. Kant did not yet use the term 'interior sense' in 1790, but he already spoke of the ultimate purposiveness of the sublime as taking stock of the 'overall determination of the mind' (KU 5:259; my translation) in a single intuition. Both involve self-assessment: that of interior sense is felt and pragmatic; that of the sublime state of mind invokes our practical vocation.

5. Character and reason

The interior sense of Part One of the *Anthropology* anticipates what Kant refers to as character in Part Two. The importance of human character is stressed in all the lectures on anthropology, but we first find a separate

⁵ See Makkreel (1990), 73–87 and 92–9 for a more detailed analysis of the sublime.

part devoted to it in the extensive *Friedländer* notes. Character represents a principled way of life whereby persons make something of themselves. To develop character means to acquire the resolve to act on moral principle and 'not to fly off hither and yon' (A 7:292) like those who subject themselves to the obscure and involuntary contents of their inner sense. What was referred to earlier as equanimity seems to be an important constituent of the resolve that is needed to build moral character.

I have interpreted what the *Anthropology* says about the interior sense as the capacity for felt self-assessment. The overall self-determination involved in the sublime and in the development of moral character goes further in that both move to the level of judgment and reason. To possess character is to have 'inner worth' by living according to the maxim of reason, which is to be consistently true to oneself.

With the aim of developing persons with a good character who exhibit wisdom in their mode of life, the cognitive faculties need to be properly cultivated and made productive. This means first of all that the imagination needs to be pushed beyond its passive mode of fantasy (*Phantasie*). The productive power of the imagination (*Einbildungskraft*) can manifest itself in associating representations that have frequently followed each other to produce some useful habits. But these associations are not rule-bound and need to be tamed by 'sensibility's productive faculty of affinity' (A 7:176). Kant defines affinity as 'the union of a manifold in virtue of its derivation from one ground' and advises that 'in silent thinking as well as in the sharing of thoughts, there must always be a *theme* on which the manifold is strung' (A 7:176; italics added). This imaginative faculty of affinity provides 'rules of sensibility' (A 7:177) that I will call *thematic*, for they fall short of the *conceptual* consciousness of a rule as a rule. Only the understanding can provide a consciousness of rules as universal. Accordingly, the imaginative union of affinity produces a thematic generality that is '*in conformity with the understanding although not derived from it*' (A 7:177, original emphasis).

After warning about the ways in which the imagination can play with us and lead us astray if we do not use the power of judgment, Kant turns to some further positive uses of the imagination in the section on 'visualising the past and future' (A 7:182), by means of memory and foresight. Memory and foresight make a voluntary use of the imagination 'to connect in a coherent experience what *no longer exists* with what *does not yet exist* through what *presently exists*' (A 7:182, original emphasis).

Elaborating on the nature of memory, Kant points out that the skills of recalling things easily and of retaining them for a long time rarely exist

together. That is why methods of cultivating memorisation are important. Kant distinguishes three such methods. The first method is *mechanical* and based on frequent word-for-word repetition. The second method is called *ingenious* because it associates representations that have a mere contingent relation with each other. The first method is rejected as too cumbersome and the second as unreliable. What is needed is a remedial third method of *judicious* memorising that orders things by general themes and maps them topically. It imagines 'a *table* of the *divisions* of a system . . . where, if one should forget something, one can find it again through the enumeration of the parts that one has retained' (A 7:184, original emphasis). Ordering representations topically is to align the imagination with judgment. Kant recommends a 'judicious use of *topics*, that is, a framework of general concepts, called *commonplaces*' (A 7:184). Such a topical framework can provide an orientational system in which a part that has been forgotten can be found by locating it with reference to other thematically related parts that have been retained.

Memory is obviously useful in contributing to self-cognition. It can judiciously fill in what the immediate rush of the contents of inner sense often leaves obscure and random-seeming. What foresight can disclose about ourselves may be less clear, but it is this imaginative capacity that interests Kant more than any other, 'because it is the condition of all possible practice and of the ends to which the human being relates the use of his powers' (A 7:185). Foresight is at least in part a function of our desires and can thus provide insight into our character. Indeed, character is what allows a living being's 'vocation to be cognized in advance' (A 7:329).

Following up on the relation between memory and foresight, Kant turns to our ability to use signs. The power to signify is described as using 'the present as the means for connecting the representation of the foreseen with that of the past' (A 7:191). When Kant introduced memory and foresight, he related the past, present and future in terms of a temporal experiential continuum. One can start from present experience to either go back to visualise the past or go forward to visualise the future. But when discussing the power to signify, something present is used as a sign to help us think simultaneously about the past and the future. The something present is a sensuous representation (*Vorstellung*) that is made imaginatively 'representative' (*stellvertretend*) (VA-Busolt 25:1473) of other non-present things. In the *Busolt Lectures* of 1788–9 Kant distinguishes between signs that merely accompany what is thought and signs that become representative symbols for it. The importance of imaginative symbols is reinforced in the final *Anthropology*, but there the language reflects §59 of the *Critique of*

the Power of Judgment. Now the notion of a symbol being representative (*stellvertretend*) is replaced by its being presentational (*darstellend*). The new wording is as follows:

Symbols are mere means used by the understanding to provide its concept with meaning [*Bedeutung*] through the intuitive presentation [*Darstellung*] of an object for it. But they are indirect means only, owing to an *analogy* with certain intuitions to which this concept can be applied. (A 7:191, original emphasis; my translation)

Symbols are imaginative representations that are not used to directly refer to (*deuten*) particular things but to give multiple things meaning (*Bedeutung*) by indirectly presenting them.

The symbolic extension of the imagination produces linguistic characterisation and allows us to converse with ourselves in a thoughtful way, instead of vainly trying through introspection to visualise ourselves perceptually. This is summed up nicely in §39 of the *Anthropology*: ‘All language is a signification of thought and, on the other hand, the best way of signifying thought is through *language, the greatest instrument for understanding ourselves and others*’ (A 7:192; italics added). Thinking is then characterized as both ‘speaking with oneself’ and ‘listening to oneself inwardly’ (A 7:192).⁶ Just as this power to signify puts things in the past and in the future on the same level of thought, it puts the self and others in communion. We can learn about ourselves and our character through linguistic comparison with others.

Character is defined by Kant ‘as a way of thinking’ (*Denkungsart*) (A 7:291) that involves self-prescription, namely the binding of one’s behaviour by means of practical principles. What a person ‘has pre-scribed [*vorgeschrieben*] to himself’ (A 7:292) as his character is a way of thinking that at the same time requires linguistic characterisation to be communicable.⁷ The determination of character seems to require a communal context and this will be confirmed in what follows.

We can properly determine what to make of ourselves as human beings only by moving to the higher cognitive faculty, namely ‘understanding as the faculty of thinking (representing something by means of concepts)’ (A 7:196). When the higher cognitive faculty is considered, not by itself, but in relation to the cognition of objects, it consists not only of understanding, but also of judgment and reason. Understanding in the second or narrower

⁶ The primacy that listening has over perceiving for understanding is one of the hallmarks of Heidegger’s thought. See Heidegger (2010), 157–8.

⁷ For more on the relation between character and characterisation, see Makkreel (2001a), 197–9.

sense is the faculty of rules, judgment that of discerning particulars as instances of rules, and reason that of deriving particulars from universals and representing them as necessary according to some principle. Reason is then explicated practically as the faculty of judging and acting according to principles. It is this self-prescriptive sense of reason that is needed for our moral life because we should not rely on institutional statutes and established customs.

The practical ideal of wisdom can only be approximated, but pragmatically we may move in that direction by cultivating (1) understanding to 'think for oneself', (2) judgment to 'think into the place of the other (in communication with human beings)' and (3) reason to 'always think consistently with oneself' (A 7:200). These three maxims of thinking recur throughout Kant's writings, but I do not recall them being discussed in the earlier anthropology lectures. In the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, Kant explicated the second maxim as encouraging the kind of expansive mode of thought that is necessary for forming discerning judgments of taste. But in the final *Anthropology*, where the development of character as a consistent mode of thinking is paramount, it is maturity of judgment more than discernment that is prized. The ability to use judgment to transpose oneself into the position of others takes time. Since Kant claims that judgment cannot be instructed but only exercised, it would seem that the point of self-transposition is not to learn from specific others, but to anticipate a communal way of thinking. This would conform with what Kant wrote in the third *Critique* about the *sensus communis*, whose ultimate function is to take 'account (a priori) of everyone else's way of representing in thought, in order as it were to hold its judgment up to human reason as a whole' (KU 5:293). This a priori formulation shows that there is already an implicit reference to reason in the reflection that characterises good judgment. The final task of reason is to draw all the consequences. Pragmatically, Kant's three maxims of thinking are reformulated as three demands that reason ends up making on our cognitive capacities:

- (1) At the level of understanding, I should be able to think and determine what 'I want to assert as true' (A 7:227n).
- (2) At the level of judgment, I should be able to discern 'what is at stake' (*worauf kommts an*) (A 7:227; my translation).
- (3) At the level of reason, I should be able to infer 'what comes of it' (A 7:227).

What one wants to assert as true 'requires only a clear head to understand oneself' (A 7:227; my translation). Anthropologically, the responsibility I have to think for myself and not let others think for me translates into the

responsibility to understand myself and my role in the world. Thus Kant ends Book One with the claim that ‘the most important revolution from within the human being is “his exit from his self-incurred immaturity”’ (A 7:229). Maturity requires taking charge of oneself through self-assessment.

Becoming mature requires developing good judgment, which is the talent for deciding what is appropriate in a given case. Anthropologically, this means the capacity to know what to do in the particular situations I find myself in. Good judgment is the most crucial capacity we can develop because it can focus in on the main thing that is at stake in a given life-situation. Kant acknowledges the importance of judgment when he says that once a lawyer has discerned what is really at stake in a legal dispute, ‘the verdict of reason follows by itself’ (A 7:228). To the extent that judgment is governed by the maxim of expansive thought, it should be able to justify its own position relative to the whole cosmopolitan scheme of things.

If reason’s task is to conclude what ‘comes’ of it all after we have thought and judged, it must appropriate those results in a principled manner and transform the temperament we inherited into a self-consistent character. Judging allows us to expand our mode of thinking in a communal way, but reason must bring it back to ourselves.

Having surveyed the evolution of Kant’s anthropology lectures, we see that it is made increasingly clear that self-cognition is not learning what inner sense has passively assimilated but determining what reason can actively appropriate as part of a project of self-assessment and character formation.

*Kant on the phenomenology of touch and vision**Gary Hatfield*

Kant's lectures on anthropology concern the human being as active in the world. The theoretical framework derives largely from empirical psychology, as can be seen from the fact that the larger portion of the lectures, entitled "Didactic," follows empirical psychology in distinguishing and discussing faculties of cognition, feeling, and desire. However, the purpose of Kant's anthropology, as developed into a pragmatic rather than a natural or "physiological" discipline, was not to present empirical psychology per se, but to offer some elements of empirical psychology in the service of pragmatic ends, including living an effective life domestically and in society. As is apparent especially from his *Lectures on Anthropology*, Kant added many observations drawn from life to the framework that he adopted from empirical psychology.¹

Kant divides the cognitive faculties into lower and higher: sensibility and understanding. Under sensibility, he addresses both the traditional five senses and the "inner sense" by which we become aware of our mental representations as something we experience, as well as the faculty of imagination. Among the external senses, vision and touch especially provide objective knowledge of the surrounding environment. Touch affords immediate contact with external objects; hearing and vision provide only mediate contact. And yet vision provides the most extensive cognition of external things, reaching as it does to the stars. Vision's accomplishments must rely on touch, for Kant accepts that all perception of three-dimensionality arises from touch. He holds a standard eighteenth-century theory of vision, according to which the immediate object of sight is two-dimensional and touch trains vision to project into the third dimension.

¹ The second, shorter part of the anthropology course and lectures considered the notion of "character" and how to form it (Stark (2003), 27–30). In the first part of the course, Kant also offered advice on cultivating worldly skill (some examples are given below), and this advice would also contribute to the formation of character.

This chapter places Kant's remarks on touch and vision into the context of his pragmatic anthropology, by considering his views of the scope, aims, and methods of that fledgling discipline. I find that Kant highlights a method of observation drawn from everyday life, which, although sometimes drawing on the theoretical apparatus of empirical psychology, does not deeply engage or endeavor to support that apparatus. Frequently, Kant considers the senses in the spirit of advising his students on how to use them and what they are good for. He supports his discussion with appeals to observation and experience that form a kind of everyday phenomenology of sensory experience.

All the same, he sometimes draws on theoretical knowledge of the senses and, I argue, envisions a pragmatic function for such knowledge. In section 1, I consider Kant's notion of the relation between the pragmatic and the theoretical, including his remarks that a pragmatic anthropology does not present theoretical or "scholastic" knowledge but focuses on "worldly" knowledge. He also distinguishes between considering human beings as natural and as potentially improvable through instruction in pragmatic topics. There has been uncertainty about what type of "natural" knowledge of human beings Kant intends to contrast with the pragmatic, especially regarding empirical psychology itself. I find not only that empirical psychology is natural knowledge but, in sections 2 and 3, that such natural knowledge is properly invoked as part of worldly (pragmatic) knowledge. Sections 2 and 3 concern, respectively, Kant on the five senses and on touch and vision. In relating these discussions to Kant's views on empirical psychology, I draw on his *Lectures on Anthropology*, his published *Anthropology*, the part of his *Lectures on Metaphysics* on empirical psychology, and his *Critique of Pure Reason*.

1. The scope, aims, and methods of Kant's anthropology

Kant's anthropology has a curious place in his scheme of philosophical disciplines. It is pragmatic and yet grounded in the theoretical. It concerns human nature, not individual human beings. Yet it is filled with examples designed to be of interest to the individual human beings that formed the original audience of the lectures: young men at university.² As described in

² In a version of the lectures first published in 1831 as edited by Johann Adam Bergk (using the pseudonym Fr. Ch. Starke), the lectures state, "Our anthropology can be read by everyone, even by women at the dressing-table" (VA-Menschenkunde 25:857). The Preface of Kant's published *Anthropology* describes the work as "popular" and for the "reading public" (A 7:121). At some point, Kant was looking beyond his university audience as he gave the lectures.

the oft-quoted letter to Herz of 1773, Kant regarded his anthropology as a new “academic discipline,” an “empirical study,” that would “disclose the sources of all the practical sciences, the science of morality, of skill, of human intercourse, of the way to educate and govern human beings, and thus of everything that pertains to the practical” (C 10:145–6). This description makes it seem as if Kant intended the anthropology to include the empirical basis of morality, and indeed that seems to have been among his initial intentions. But, as Manfred Kuehn (2006) explains in his Introduction to the published *Anthropology*, Kant changed that conception in the 1780s and strictly separated his pragmatic anthropology from the foundations of practical philosophy. It would at best discuss applications of moral philosophy, not contribute to the empirical basis for it.

Already in the letter of 1773, and in the early lectures on anthropology, Kant conceives the lectures as focusing less on morals and more on effective action in the social sphere. He presents his anthropology as “an analysis of the nature of skill (prudence) and even wisdom that, along with physical geography and distinct from all other learning, can be called knowledge of the world” (C 10:146).³ As he said frequently in the lectures themselves, this skill was to be “worldly” and not “scholastic” (e.g. VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:853; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1209). Methodologically, it would proceed from experience and observation, by discussing “phenomena and their laws” by drawing on “observations of ordinary life”; it would avoid a deep theoretical concern with the “foundations of the possibility of human thinking in general” (C 10:145–6).

The emphasis on worldly skill gives some sense of what Kant meant in labeling his anthropology “pragmatic.” As his lectures developed, Kant highlighted another aspect of the pragmatic. He contrasts the “pragmatic” study of human beings with the study of human beings as merely natural; that is, as manifesting natural capacities, which are studied in empirical psychology considered as a theoretical discipline.⁴ In fact, this

³ Physical geography is another “pragmatic” discipline, which considers human beings as they vary in different environmental circumstances. By contrast with pragmatic anthropology, physical geography considers human beings from the standpoint of “nature,” including racial differences (VA-*Pillau* 25:733; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1195). There has been ongoing discussion of whether Kant’s anthropology lectures stem from his physical geography or from empirical psychology. For an overview, see Wilson (2006), Chapter 1. As worldly knowledge, Kant saw anthropology as complementing physical geography. In its theoretical basis, Kant’s pragmatic anthropology draws extensively on empirical psychology – though, as described herein, it is not “mere” empirical psychology but puts such theoretical knowledge to pragmatic use, while also supplementing it with observations drawn from life.

⁴ On the development of empirical psychology in the eighteenth century and its relation to the notion of “anthropology” more generally, see Hatfield (1995); and Vidal (2011).

distinction frames his conception of anthropology from the very beginning. Its interpretation, however, has proven elusive.

1.1. *Pragmatic versus physiological*

The Preface of the published *Anthropology* evokes a distinction that developed in Kant's thinking about anthropology in the 1770s. It distinguishes pragmatic anthropology from "physiology":

A doctrine of knowledge of the human being, systematically formulated (anthropology), can exist either in a physiological or in a pragmatic point of view. – Physiological knowledge of the human being concerns the investigation of what *nature* makes of the human being; pragmatic, the investigation of what *he* as a free-acting being makes of himself, or can and should make of himself. (A 7:119, original emphasis)

This passage is followed by some remarks about the futility of seeking to understand human memory capacities by speculating about brain traces, given the (at that time) lack of knowledge of "cranial nerves and fibers" (A 7:119).

By emphasizing the disparaging remarks on brain traces, this whole passage has been read to imply that the fundamental distinction between Kant's pragmatic anthropology and a "physiological" anthropology is that the former concerns human behavior in the world and the latter attempts to know the human being in an anatomical-physiological way.⁵ This interpretation seems to accord with the letter to Herz, in which Kant also rejected the "eternally futile inquiries as to the manner in which bodily organs are connected with thought" (C 10:145). The connection is correct in one way. In the letter, Kant is remarking on Herz's review of Platner's *Anthropologie*, a work that focused on the human being as a combination of body and soul in interaction – although Platner was clear that he wasn't focusing exclusively on anatomy and physiology, any more than he was focusing exclusively on psychology, but rather on how the interplay between mind and body conditions human mental life (Platner (1772), xvii).

Nonetheless, this interpretation misses the primary contrast that Kant was drawing between a "physiological" and a "pragmatic" anthropology, which is between studying human beings as part of nature and studying

⁵ Many scholars simply assimilate the term "physiology" to its present-day meaning, as what I below characterize as medical physiology, e.g. Zammito (2002), 297; Jacobs and Kain (2003a), 3, 5; Wood (2003), 40; Sturm (2009), 265. Brandt (1999), 59–61, recognizes the broader and narrower meanings of *Physiologie* and related terms, but does not notice that Kant used that term with its narrower meaning (of medical physiology) only after about 1780.

them for pragmatic ends. Human beings are studied as natural in both medicine (including medical physiology) and empirical psychology. I believe that Kant wished to contrast, on the one hand, medical physiology and empirical psychology as branches of the doctrine of nature with, on the other hand, pragmatic anthropology as the application of natural knowledge to the sphere of action in the world. In this latter enterprise he does not reject all natural knowledge, for he draws on empirical psychology. Accordingly, he does not reject anatomical-physiological considerations simply because they are natural, but because they are in such a poor state of development that they offer no help in pragmatic anthropology. But empirical psychology does help. Its findings are put to new, pragmatic use.⁶

The interpretative question turns on realizing that Kant used the term “physiology” and its variants in two ways. First, across his entire career, including the *Critique of Pure Reason* and the published *Anthropology*, he used the term to mean the study of nature in general, of which physics and empirical psychology are branches. Second, from sometime in the early 1780s he also used the term to refer more specifically to what he termed “medical physiology” (*Physiologie des Artztes* – Ref 15:964; see also A 7:176, 214, 286) or the combined area of “anatomy-physiology” (SOS 12:31). The first, broader meaning of the term is in play in distinguishing pragmatic from physiological anthropology.

Kant clearly intended “physiology” as the study of nature to include empirical psychology. In metaphysical lectures from the mid-1770s, Kant discusses the various divisions of “physiology” or the “cognition of nature” (VM-L₁ 28:222–3). Such a physiology is always a “cognition of the objects of the senses,” but it may be pursued either rationally (through pure concepts) or empirically. This physiology can also be classified by subject matter:

Since physiology is a cognition of the objects of the senses, one easily can comprehend the *classification* when one notes that one has two sorts of sense, namely an *outer* and an *inner* sense . . . The physiology of outer sense is *physics*, and the physiology of inner sense is *psychology*. (VM-L₁ 28:222, original emphasis)

There is no question here of medical physiology or of inner physiological processes such as digestion or respiration or nerve activity. Psychology is a part of the study of nature.⁷ In these lectures, Kant reflects on the status

⁶ Allen Wood’s “General introduction” (Wood (2013), 4–5) describes how in the *Lectures on Anthropology* Kant drew on empirical psychology for pragmatic ends.

⁷ The point is made again in lectures provisionally dated to c.1790: “All science that has nature as an object is called *physiology*”; both physics and psychology are “physiology” and empirical psychology is

of empirical psychology and its misplacement within metaphysics, and he suggests that, since empirical psychology “has already become quite large, and it will attain almost as great a magnitude as empirical physics,” the time may have come for it to become an “academic science” (VM-L₁ 28:223–4; cf. VM-*Mrongovius* 29:876); that is, a free-standing discipline – a status he also envisioned for anthropology.

Lest it be thought that such usage is peculiar to Kant’s lectures on metaphysics, in the first *Critique* Kant provides an even more elaborate division of the branches of “physiology” as the study of “nature” as “the sum total of given objects” (KrV A845/B873). The metaphysics of nature is rational physiology and is divided into “transcendent” and “immanent”; the latter deals with nature as the sum of all objects of the senses and includes both rational physics and rational psychology (KrV A846/B874).⁸ Earlier in the work, he had characterized empirical psychology as “a species of the *physiology* of inner sense” (KrV A347/B405, original emphasis). When, in the Preface to the first edition, Kant describes Locke as approaching metaphysics through a “certain *physiology* of the human understanding” (KrV Axi, original emphasis), he clearly is not accusing him of resorting to a (medical) physiology of cognition (which would be an erroneous description of Locke’s method) but is describing him as approaching cognition naturalistically.⁹

In the published *Anthropology*, both senses of the term “physiology” are in use. Medical physiology is invoked several times (A 7:176, 214, 286). He also uses the sense of “physiology” as the study of nature, including in the target passage previously quoted. In discussing “representations that we have without being aware of them,” he uses as an example the many obscure “sensuous intuitions and sensations” that any human being has at any time (A 7:135). He then observes: “the field of obscure representations is the largest in the human being. – But because this field can

improperly placed in metaphysics (VM-L₂ 28:541), which is where it was located in the textbook for Kant’s lectures on anthropology and his lectures on metaphysics, Alexander Baumgarten’s *Metaphysica* (1757).

⁸ The notion of “immanent rational psychology” that Kant invokes is not the traditional transcendent rational psychology, whose possibility has been undermined in the first *Critique*, but consists in such a priori knowledge of the phenomena of inner sense as is possible through pure reason after critique. In the *Prolegomena*, we learn that this includes the application of the law of cause to the phenomena of inner sense (Prol 4:295). See Hatfield (1992), 217–19.

⁹ Similarly, in the Antinomies, when Kant contrasts a “physiological” investigation into the motive causes of an action, such as occurs in “anthropology,” with considering the same actions from the point of view of practical reason, the term “physiological” does not mean medical physiology or an appeal to brain states, but rather an empirical investigation into behavior according to empirically discovered rules in conformity with “the order of nature” (KrV A549–50/B577–8).

only be perceived in his passive side as a play of sensations, the theory of obscure representations belongs only to physiological anthropology, not to pragmatic anthropology" (A 7:136). The "sensations" under discussion are not states of sensory nerves or instances of brain activity, but they are phenomenally characterized ideas, such as are filled in from memory and imagination when looking at an object that is far away but still recognizable (its parts are obscurely present). Another example is the anticipatory ideas that arise when one hears a piece of music, ideas that allow one to detect immediately that a discordant sound has been produced by a musician. Because such detection takes place immediately, these obscure ideas must be phenomenally at the ready; but they are not noticed and attended to unless the musician makes a mistake (A 135–6).

Passages from the *Lectures on Anthropology* support the interpretative point that Kant intended to distinguish his pragmatic anthropology not merely from anatomical-physiological speculations about mind–brain relations but also from empirical psychology as a study of nature. In the earliest surviving notes (1772–3), Kant uses the term "physiology of outer sense" in comparing anthropology to physics, inasmuch as both are founded upon "observation and experience" (VA-*Collins* 25:7). These early lectures target the distinction between "what is natural to the human being and what is artificial or habitual about him" as the "chief object" of Kant's anthropology.¹⁰ This distinction coincides with the later one between the human being as natural and as free – for Kant soon makes clear that what is habitual in a human being is subject to alteration, which can arise from external circumstances (passively) or through self-activity (VA-*Collins* 25:15–16). The Parow lectures from the same time begin by saying that "[e]mpirical psychology is a species of natural doctrine" (VA-*Parow* 25:243). After noting that both physics and psychology rely on appearances (and so are empirical), Kant again focuses his anthropology on distinguishing "what is natural and artificial in a human being" (VA-*Parow* 25:244). He also distinguishes the soul or mind under separate terms insofar as it is passive or active (VA-*Parow* 25:247) and notes that human beings have the capacity to control and modify their powers, faculties, and talents (VA-*Parow* 25:437–8).

Other sets of lectures explicitly distinguish Kant's pragmatic anthropology not merely from anatomical-physiological speculation but also from empirical psychology. In the lectures of 1775–6, Kant makes the usual

¹⁰ Kant also notes that he will not be speculating on the brain–mind relation (VA-*Collins* 25:9), but he does not use the term "physiology" (medical physiology) in this connection.

point about the parallel between the empirical study of outer and inner sense, he distinguishes theoretical from worldly knowledge (VA-Friedländer 25:469), and affirms that his anthropology is pragmatic rather than speculative or theoretical. He describes the relation of anthropology to empirical psychology:

anthropology is not a description of human beings, but of human nature. Thus we consider the knowledge of human beings in regard to their nature. Knowledge of humanity is at the same time my knowledge. Thus a natural knowledge must lie at the basis, in accordance with which we can judge what is basic to every human being. Then we have secure principles in terms of which we can proceed. Hence we must study ourselves, and since we want to apply this to others, we must thus study humanity, not, however, psychologically or speculatively, but pragmatically. For all pragmatic doctrines are doctrines of prudence, where for all our skills we also have the means to make proper use of everything. (VA-Friedländer 25:471)

The distinction between pragmatic anthropology and theoretical or speculative (empirical) psychology is clear.¹¹ The passage also suggests (although this is not as straightforward) that natural knowledge in the form of empirical psychology forms a basis for anthropology.¹² Lectures provisionally dated to 1781–2 distinguish both “psychology and physiology” (the latter here being medical physiology), as speculative or theoretical, from pragmatic anthropology (VA-Menschenkunde 25:855). Lectures from 1784 distinguish the “scholastic” empirical psychology of Baumgarten (whose classifications as reflected in textual divisions are to be retained) from pragmatic anthropology (VA-Mrongovius 25:1214). Lectures from 1788–9 distinguish pragmatic anthropology from “theoretical anthropology, which merely poses questions and contains in itself only psychological investigations” (VA-Busolt 25:1436).

The relation between scholastic and theoretical philosophy, on the one hand, and pragmatic anthropology, on the other, may be clarified by considering an example in which the former condition the latter but the latter

¹¹ This complicated passage is rendered even more complex by the fact that Kant held that human nature is given by nature but can be developed pragmatically, in the formation of “character” (A 7:321).

¹² In the same lectures, Kant earlier described pragmatic knowledge as a place “where one can make use of all theoretical knowledge” (VA-Friedländer 25:469), which suggests that the natural knowledge at the base of pragmatic anthropology is conditioned by theoretical knowledge and does not depend simply on unguided pragmatic observations. And indeed he invokes “psychological” considerations later in the lectures (e.g. VA-Friedländer 25:568). He also distinguishes the “psychologist” from the “medical doctor” (VA-Friedländer 25:605), indicating that he does not assimilate these two areas (as is assumed when the contrast with “pragmatic” anthropology is rendered as *medical-physiological* anthropology alone).

makes new applications. In lectures on metaphysics and on logic, Kant discussed “egoism” under the meaning of solipsism: one forms the belief that only he or she exists, that only his or her phenomena are real.¹³ This discussion relates to psychological and epistemological questions about the reliability of the senses, to cosmological questions of what exists in the world, and to logical questions concerning the value of other people’s opinions. In the published *Anthropology*, Kant discussed egoism under what are surely three *scholastic* labels: logical egoism, aesthetic egoism, and moral egoism. The discussion of logical egoism made contact with the metaphysical (or psychological and epistemological) question of the reliability of the senses. Kant excluded any metaphysical refutation of egoism from anthropology (A 7:130). But he discussed the reliability of the senses (which also arises in psychology and metaphysics) from a pragmatic point of view. If uncertain of our own sensory experience (e.g. a ringing in the ears), we may need “to ask others whether it seemed the same to them” (A 7:129). The scholastic question of the reliability of the senses *in general* is put aside for the *pragmatic* question of what to do when, in a particular instance, one is uncertain of one’s sensory perception. As the discussion ensues, Kant contrasts egoism with pluralism and, in effect, endorses the latter: “The opposite of egoism can only be *pluralism*, that is, the way of thinking in which one is not concerned with oneself as the whole world, but rather regards and conducts oneself as a mere citizen of the world” (A 7:130, original emphasis). In the anthropology lectures, Kant commends modesty over egoism (VA-Pillau 25:735; also VA-Mrongovius 25:1215–16).

Kant’s discussion of attention and abstraction puts the framework of empirical psychology to pragmatic use. In the published *Anthropology*, Kant describes the abilities of attending and abstracting: “The endeavor to become conscious of one’s representations is either the *paying attention to* (*attentio*) or the *turning away from* an idea of which I am conscious (*abstractio*)” (A 7:131, original emphasis). The definitions are straight out of Baumgarten (1757, §625). Kant puts this distinction from Baumgarten’s empirical psychology to pragmatic use in discussing the benefits of being able to control one’s attention and to abstract from current perceptions:

¹³ From metaphysical lectures on rational psychology in the early 1790s: “Egoism maintains that it could not be proved that there are bodies outside us” (VM-K₂ 28:770); see also VM-Dohna (28:680). Kant also discussed egoism in the cosmological portion of the lectures on metaphysics, *Metaphysik* Herder (1762–4): “An egoist thinks that I, who am thinking here, am the only simple being, without connection with others” (VM-Herder 28:42); see also VM-L₁ (28:206–7); VM-Mrongovius (29:928). And he discussed it in the lectures on logic (e.g. VL-Blomberg 24:187).

Many human beings are unhappy because they cannot abstract. The suitor could make a good marriage if only he could overlook a wart on his beloved's face, or a gap between her teeth. But it is an especially bad habit of our faculty of attention to fix itself directly, even involuntarily, on what is faulty in others . . . If the essentials are good, then it is not only fair, but also prudent, to *look away from* the misfortune of others, yes, even from our own good fortune. But this faculty of abstraction is a strength of mind that can only be acquired by experience. (A 7:132, original emphasis; see also VA-Friedländer 25:490; VA-Mrongovius 25:1239–41)

The notions of attention and abstraction are derived from an understanding of what nature gives to humans (this would be a “physiological” understanding in the broad sense). The advice to cultivate the power of abstraction concerns what human beings can make of themselves through the exercise of freedom in cultivating their abilities. Here we have a “physiological” basis (in empirical psychology) for a “pragmatic” lesson (concerning human freedom and prudence).

1.2. *The method of pragmatic anthropology: experience and observation*

In comparing his anthropology to empirical psychology and physics, Kant emphasized that, as empirical disciplines, all three are based on experience and observation. However, Kant recognized difficulties in self-observation (introspection), observation of others, and the use of experience as sources for anthropology and psychology. Nonetheless, he believed that these difficulties did not exclude these sources if proper care and a proper attitude were taken.

In the lectures and published *Anthropology*, Kant frequently noted the difficulties of self-observation (e.g., VA-Menschenkunde 25:857; A 7:132–4). Introspection is difficult because the act of observing disturbs one's mental state. Attempts to attentively track one's sense perceptions lead to melancholy and perhaps insanity. All the same, it is possible to engage in introspection. Care must be taken not to do it for too long on any given occasion (VA-Friedländer 25:478).

More generally, self-observation can arise in several ways. First, it may arise through experiences “without any aim” and through “attentive observations of oneself and other human beings” (VA-Busolt 25:1435). Experiences “without any aim” presumably result from commerce with the world, through which we learn things about ourselves. Kant's remark on the tendency of human beings to notice the misfortunes of others may well

have been confirmed by his observations of himself and of others, not in a studied way, but through the commerce of life.

More studied observations can arise when one attempts not simply to spy on oneself (“candidly,” so to speak) but instead purposely exercises one’s mental capacities: “To observe the various acts of representative power in myself, when I summon them, is indeed worth reflection; it is necessary for logic and metaphysics” (A 7:133). It also does work in anthropology, as in Kant’s various observations on memory or imagination, faculties he can engage at will. As he puts it, “we play with the imagination frequently and gladly” (A 7:175).

Additionally, we may gain observations of ourselves in the course of observing others. It is difficult to observe others, because if they notice our doing so they may become embarrassed and change their behavior or even dissemble (VA-*Busolt* 25:1437; A 7:121). Nonetheless, a skilled observer can overcome such obstacles, while also making gains in self-observation:

It is therefore difficult to observe the mind of the human being, as soon as his incentives are in play. However, this difficulty is diminished once one begins to observe others, because one can be very peaceful near by, and from time to time one can apply these observations to oneself. For since one is already in possession of some knowledge, as a result one can also observe oneself more correctly when the mind is active . . . The gentleman does not want to be studied, and in order to conceal this cunning he advances with the growth of culture, where one does not simply dissemble but also shows the opposite of oneself. We must therefore observe human beings so that we do not in the least give the appearance of being an observer, and we must also dissemble. One must position oneself as though one would speak entirely without caution and is thereby able to pay attention to everything that others say. (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:857)

Skill at observing others transfers to oneself. Skill in observing others involves learning how to observe without seeming to do so. This is not easy: “it is always difficult to get to know human beings while one is observing their actions, because this demands an educated and acute observer” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:857). But it is not impossible. It just demands skill.

Kant lists other aids for anthropology, including history, biography, and plays and novels (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:857–8; A 7:121). For our purposes, in considering his remarks on the senses of touch and vision, the method mainly consists in self-observation, in remembrance of experiences that occurred “without any aim,” in attending for some brief period of time to one’s sensory experience, in willfully engaging the senses and noticing the outcome, and in noting some common (if mistaken) opinions about

the senses. Such observations, as applied to the pragmatic part of Kant's discussion of the senses, have the feel of a phenomenology of everyday living. At the same time, Kant also introduces theoretically guided accounts of sensory appearances into his pragmatic anthropology, presumably as a proper part of worldly knowledge.

2. The five senses

Kant derived the framework for his discussion of the five external senses from his lectures on metaphysics, especially those on empirical psychology. In both empirical psychology and anthropology he categorizes the senses into those that are comparatively objective and those that are comparatively subjective: "The objective senses provide more cognition, and provide occasion for reflection, but the subjective senses have more sensation than reflection" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:495; see also VM-L_I 28:231; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1242; A 7:154). Objective senses are also described as providing intuition (representation of objects) by comparison with sensation (often allied with enjoyment). Sight, touch, and hearing are the objective senses. They are informative concerning objects and provide less of a feeling of bodily sensation in their operation. Taste and smell are the subjective senses. They give a strong feeling of sensation in the body, often allied with pleasure or displeasure. The division into objective and subjective is not categorical but comparative; the objective senses include some sensation and the subjective senses are in some ways informative, for example regarding the quality of foodstuffs or the presence of carrion (VA-*Mrongovius* 28:1247; A 7:154–9; VM-L_I 28:231).

The theoretical framework of the senses also includes a discussion of the passivity of the senses, the need for a faculty of understanding in order to perceive objects through the senses, and the unnoticed inclusion of judgments in sensory experience in the case of illusion – and, in fact, in normal perception as well (VM-L_I 28:232–5; A 7:143–50). These points about the senses reflect standard aspects of the early modern theoretical tradition of the senses (Hatfield (1990), [Chapter 2](#)). They are not, and Kant does not present them as, conclusions discovered through simple observation of everyday experiences and the use of the senses in the commerce of life.

In anthropology, Kant adds pragmatic aspects to the framework of the senses as drawn from empirical psychology. For instance, in the discussion of smell and taste, in addition to noting their relative subjectivity and aspects of their operation through chemical reception of fine particles (e.g. VA-*Friedländer* 25:494–5), Kant discusses their properties as experienced in

society. Smell is the more social sense. A good or bad smell is imposed on all who are nearby; hence, individuals may be concerned about how they smell. Taste is more private. Only the person who is eating tastes that particular food, although one may distribute the object of taste by encouraging others to taste something (VA-*Friedländer* 25:496; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1245–8; A 7:157–9). In another case, he offers pragmatic advice about choosing the colors of jacket and vest. The advice may rely on his understanding of the theory of color, but it is phenomenological in its presentation and particulars. Kant recommends choosing a blue jacket and a yellow vest, which (he says) yields a pleasant aspect of an overall impression of green.¹⁴ By contrast, wearing a yellow jacket with a blue vest yields “a dirty color” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:497–8). He also notes that bright colors bring out ruddy facial complexions and make pale complexions look even paler (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1244). These feel like observations drawn from life.

3. Touch and vision

Kant’s discussion of touch and vision includes a similar mixture of a theoretical framework that guides the discussion paired with phenomenological observations concerning everyday sensory experience. Indeed, these elements are thoroughly intermixed in his discussion, although we may need to consult some other writings of Kant to detect the theoretical framework.

In the character of phenomenological observations, Kant notes the respective strengths of sight and touch in informing human beings about their surroundings. Touch is the most accurate sense, because we are in direct contact with the object. As compared with sight, touch can assure us that a thing is really there. If we see a rose “hovering in the air” via a concave mirror, we “can find out only through feeling whether it really is a rose” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1242). In this way, touch informs us of the substantiality of things. By contrast, of all the senses sight covers the largest sphere. Through vision, we can see the stars (A 7:156; see also VA-*Friedländer* 25:498; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1243). It is a spatial sense: “Sight presents the shapes of things in space and divides space” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:494). Sight is a “play of shape” (496). Normally, seeing doesn’t seem to offer us any sensation at all, only objects (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1243).¹⁵ These observations describe sight and touch as those senses might be used in everyday

¹⁴ Kant (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1245) draws on the standard artist’s primaries of the eighteenth century: yellow, red, and blue (Kemp (1990), [Chapter 7](#)). Yellow and blue pigments mix to make green, but it is not clear that a blue jacket and a yellow vest yield green.

¹⁵ But, theoretically, we know that light and color are sensations (VA-*Friedländer* 25:496).

settings. They describe their use by an adult human being in the commerce of life. They are pragmatic reflections about what the senses are good for.

Kant also introduces a more theoretically informed set of considerations into his anthropological discussions of sight and touch. Because Kant nowhere offers a systematic description of the theory of visual perception as a sensory capacity (as opposed to analyzing sensibility for its contribution to cognition in the first *Critique* and other works), these elements must be detected by noting ways in which they conform to more widely held eighteenth-century theoretical tenets that can be attributed to Kant by implication from his scattered remarks.

It was widely held in the eighteenth century that the immediate object of vision is a two-dimensional image, having the properties described by linear perspective. As a matter of physical fact, such an image is cast upon a stationary eye at any given moment. Accordingly, the fact that we seem to see in three dimensions requires explanation. The dominant opinion was that touch educates vision. We learn to see the third dimension by correlating various optical “cues” with the felt locations of things.¹⁶

Adherents of this standard view also accepted a certain analysis of size perception. In the optics of sight, an object of a constant size projects an ever smaller image on the retina as its distance from the eye increases. The size of the retinal image of an object in a given dimension is termed the “visual angle” for that object. If we saw size strictly according to visual angle, then when an object moved from five feet away to ten feet away, it would appear half as tall. This prediction is not borne out by experience, as many theorists noted. Accordingly, these theorists postulated that the perceived size of an object is a product of its visual angle and its perceived distance. The most commonly held theory was that the angle and distance are combined in an unnoticed act of judgment.¹⁷ If the distance to the object is accurately perceived, then its size should also be perceived accurately. Two persons of the same height standing five and ten feet away should appear visually to be equal in height. This would be a case of what would now be called perfect size constancy.¹⁸

¹⁶ This position was held in variant forms by Berkeley (1709); Porterfield (1759); and Reid (1785). For discussion of their positions, including both similarities and differences, and an elaboration of the optical cues for size and distance, see Hatfield (1990), Chapter 2.

¹⁷ The alternative theory, held by Berkeley (1709), was that visual size (which equals visual angle) is altered to correspond to tactual size (the size the object is felt to have) through a process of suggestion or association that is distinguished from judgment, a distinction discussed in Hatfield (2009), 130–6.

¹⁸ On the history of discussions and theories of size constancy, see Ross and Plug (1998).

There is good evidence that Kant accepted the basic tenets of this theory. A direct statement of the point that perception of the full (three-dimensional) shapes of things depends on touch occurs in the published *Anthropology*:

This sense [touch] is the only one of immediate external perception; and for this reason it is the most reliably instructive. . . . Without this sense organ we would be unable to form any concept at all of a bodily shape, and so the two other senses of the first class [sight and hearing] must originally be referred to its perception in order to provide cognition of experience. (A 7:155)

“Cognition of experience” is cognition of objects, which depends on both sensibility and understanding – this is a theoretical point about cognition that is repeated in the *Anthropology* (A 7:140, 144). For present purposes, the important point of the passage is that sight – even though it has been designated the sense of space and shape on phenomenological grounds – is here revealed on theoretical grounds as being dependent on touch for instruction in perceiving bodily shape. (Hearing, Kant holds, does not perceive shape but does perceive distance, presumably under the instruction of touch.)

When touch educates vision, the results of this education become habitual, so that we judge the three-dimensional sizes and shapes of things by sight without knowing that we do – which is why, phenomenologically, vision can seem to be the sense for space and shape. Kant’s subscription to the standard theory is clear from *Anthropology Lectures* of 1791–2:

[Touch] is the main objective sense and only by means of it can we perceive the shape and measure of a body. For the eyes present us objects only in a plane, although because we have so often previously received by touch the concept of the substance of the body, it becomes completely facile for us to believe that, with the eyes, we see bodies also in their thickness. Experiments undertaken with those born blind adequately prove this. They at first see, e.g., a sphere only as a circle and could not distinguish a dog from a cat before they had felt them.¹⁹

Kant here recounts the famous Cheselden experiments with the newly sighted blind.²⁰ The implication is that, through practice that co-ordinates

¹⁹ The quotation is my translation from anthropology lecture notes from winter 1791–2, as originally edited by Arnold Kowalewski and reprinted in Kant (2000), 212.

²⁰ The Cheselden case was well known. There is no mention of a sphere in the original write up, just solid bodies seen in a plane. The famous Molyneux question concerned whether a newly sighted blind person could distinguish between a sphere and cube by sight alone. In Kant’s time, the Cheselden case was discussed together with the Molyneux question in Priestley (1776), 511–14 (among many other places). On these topics, see Pastore (1971), which reprints the original Cheselden reports from the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society.

touch with vision, we learn to discern by sight objects at a distance and with their thickness or depth, even though we start from a two-dimensional representation. The results of learning become so habitual that we think we see depth immediately by sight – and indeed depth does become phenomenally immediate, even if it is (as we know by theory) psychologically or judgmentally mediated. Kant makes no claim to discover phenomenologically that the immediate visual representation (prior to the unnoticed judgments) is planar. The postulation of this planar representation and of the unnoticed judgments that yield phenomenal experience in three dimensions are both drawn from extant visual theory.²¹

Kant's discussion of the moon illusion and the illusions of the senses in the first *Critique* and anthropology offer further evidence that he accepted the standard account,²² according to which vision starts with a two-dimensional representation and the judgments that yield the third dimension become habitual and are mistakenly assigned to sense experience, so that their products appear phenomenally as bare sensory experiences. In the introduction to the Dialectic in the first *Critique*, Kant compares transcendental illusion, as something that persists even after one knows it is an illusion, to sensory illusions. Transcendental illusion

cannot be avoided at all, just as little as we can avoid it that the sea appears higher in the middle than at the shores, since we see the former through higher rays of light than the latter, or even better, just as little as the astronomer can prevent the rising moon from appearing larger to him, even when he is not deceived by this illusion. (KrV A297/B354; see also VA-Friedländer 25:476; A 7:146)

Such illusions were commonly assigned to a judgment of the understanding, not to the senses themselves. Many theorists attributed the moon illusion to an implicit judgment that assigns a larger distance to the horizon moon than to the moon overhead. There were various accounts of why the distance appears larger at the horizon, including because the moon is seen through the haze of the air and so appears dimmer, which is taken as a cue for its distance; or that the many intervening objects make something on the horizon seem farther away than something overhead.²³ However

²¹ Visual theory, including size and depth perception, was discussed in various loci in the eighteenth century, including sections on optics within mathematics, medical physiology, and empirical psychology textbooks; see Hatfield (1995), 209–16.

²² The passages on the moon illusion and sensory illusion are examined in Hatfield (1990), 101–7.

²³ Descartes (1965), 111, ascribes the illusion to a judgment of farther distance, but does not explain the judgment. Berkeley (1709), §§67–78, considers the explanation from intervening objects as yielding a judgment of lines and angles, which he rejects in favor of an associative account arising from

the impression of larger distance arises (and that impression need not be noticed), then, according to the theoretical account of size perception as combining angle and distance, the moon must be assigned a larger size if it subtends the same angle but is perceived as being farther away.

A few pages further in the *Critique*, Kant endorses the theory that unnoticed judgments underlie sensory illusions:

We draw a distinction between what is cognized immediately and what is only inferred . . . Because we constantly need inferences and so in the end become wholly accustomed to them, it happens at last that we no longer even take notice of this distinction, and often, as in the so-called illusions of sense, we take as immediate what we have only inferred. (KrV A303/B359)

When Kant states, in the published *Anthropology*, that the “full moon, which he sees ascending near the horizon through hazy air, seems to be further away, and also larger, than when it is high in the heavens” (A 7:146), he is promulgating a specific theoretical account of the phenomenon. Similarly, when he says that the senses do not deceive “because they do not judge at all” (A 7:146; see also VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1229), he is offering a theoretical account of how illusions arise (through unnoticed judgments of the understanding). This teaching presumably is pragmatic because it allows individuals to understand the basis of illusions and so not to be taken in or to blame the wrong capacity (the senses instead of the understanding). This sort of knowledge adds a further dimension to gaining “control” of one’s capacities (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1231; see also VA-*Parow* 25:437–8). Beyond gaining control of one’s sensibility to prevent it from dominating the understanding, one ought to understand the function of the senses themselves.

Understanding how the senses work can correct our unguided phenomenological impression of the direction of causation in vision. The phenomenology of vision makes it seem as if, when we see things, we as if we were touch them visually; something proceeds from our eye to the thing. This was in fact an ancient theory of vision, called an extramission theory (Ross and Plug (2002), 26–7). Kant reported this phenomenology and the “common” beliefs attending to it:

sight bears a similarity to feeling. One believes that the rays do not go from the object into our eyes, but from our eyes into other objects. This happens

the moon appearing dimmer due to the atmosphere. In Kant’s time, the judgment account based on intervening objects was discussed favorably in Priestley (1776), 504–11, who also mentioned Berkeley’s atmospheric explanation. For a survey of recent work on the moon illusion, see Ross and Plug (2002).

because it seems to us as though rays from our eyes fall on the object. Hence the common man's belief that so-called witches could cause harm through their gaze. Hence in Spain one prays in churches that God might protect them from the evil eye. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1243–4)

But, as Kant explains, in sight “we sense objects through light” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1243); that is, because light affects the eyes (VA-*Friedländer* 25:494–6). This understanding is not achieved through unguided phenomenology. Rather, it is a fruit of school learning, of theoretical knowledge of how the senses work. It behooves a worldly person to acquire this knowledge so as not to fall into the superstitions that Kant lists in the passage.

Worldly knowledge includes some theoretical knowledge, about the basis of sensory illusion or the basic processes of vision. Such school learning or theoretical knowledge is a proper part of worldly knowledge.

We have seen (subsection 1.1) that, from the earliest *Anthropology Lectures*, Kant made it a prime objective of pragmatic anthropology to distinguish what was natural from what was artificial in human beings, and that he taught that the artificial can be brought under control and improved. In the *Friedländer Lectures*, he expressed this point by distinguishing human beings under two perspectives, as “animal” and as “intelligence,” and affirming that “As intelligence, they have control over their state and over their animality” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:475). Part of this control consists in knowing when sensory appearances are deceptive and when they are illusory (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1253–4; A 7:149–50). Deception can be discovered and remedied (as when one is tricked by sleight of hand but then realizes it). Illusion differs in that it persists after being recognized (the underlying unnoticed judgments are ineradicable). A worldly individual, an “intelligence,” understands such things:

according to animality one judges that everything moves around the earth and that the earth stands still, but not according to intelligence. When the image of the moon is larger as it rises, as animal one judges that the moon is larger, although as intelligence one knows that the moon is continually the same size. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:476)

It is worldly knowledge or pragmatic intelligence to know that the earth moves – something that surely relies on theoretical knowledge. Similarly, such intelligence knows that some sensory appearances are permanently illusory. As in the case of the moon illusion or the causal direction of sight, such knowledge comes from theoretical learning. Phenomenology alone

does not decide it. The pragmatic sometimes incorporates the theoretical (the natural, or the “physiological”).

4. Conclusion

In his discussion of touch and vision, Kant offers phenomenologically based observations and advice that do not draw deeply on psychological theory. But he also makes points that do rely on theory. Such intermixture of “school learning” and theory with observations drawn from life is characteristic of Kant’s writing and lectures in anthropology. His anthropology was “pragmatic” in seeking to reveal how one might improve one’s skills in connection with many aspects of life, from choosing the color of one’s clothes to cultivating the ability to overlook blemishes. It included coming to understand some basic facts of sense perception, so as to show knowledge that goes beyond the ordinary commerce of life. Pragmatic anthropology was to impart wisdom, and knowing how sensory illusions work, or the direction of causation in the sense of vision, is part of that wisdom. Hence, certain aspects of empirical psychology or indeed of cosmology (that the earth moves) are in themselves part of “pragmatic” anthropology. In the end, theoretical knowledge is not wholly relegated to the school or insulated from worldly knowledge. In Kant’s view, a pragmatic intelligence requires some theoretical knowledge, not merely as a framework, but as constitutive of being worldly.

*Meat on the bones: Kant's account of cognition
in the anthropology lectures*

Tim Jankowiak and Eric Watkins

Though many crucial details of Kant's account of cognition as it is developed in the *Critique of Pure Reason* continue to be a matter of vigorous scholarly debate, widespread agreement reigns about its basic structure. No one disputes whether Kant argues that space and time are a priori forms of intuition through which objects are given to us, nor that the categories are forms of (conceptual) thought through which we think about (or judge) objects. Further, it is fundamental to Kant's position that these intuitive and conceptual forms are a priori because they are conditions on the possibility of experience. What's more, both kinds of form are necessary for us to have any substantive cognition (whether of the world or of ourselves), since Kant's view of cognition (as a conscious representation that relates to an object (KrV A320/B376)) requires that every object of cognition be both given to us in sensibility and thought by our understanding.¹ Given the way that he defines sensibility and understanding as faculties that are distinct in kind rather than degree, and given that cognition requires the co-operation of these distinct faculties, it is clear that the *Critique of Pure Reason* commits Kant to an ambitious philosophical agenda.

Whatever interpretation of Kant's first *Critique* one arrives at and however one evaluates its fundamental arguments and conclusions, there is also substantial agreement that its explicit focus with respect to cognition is limited. For it is expressly devoted to explaining the possibility and limits of a priori cognition and does not contain detailed discussions of those features that would be specific to *empirical* cognition. Specifically, since one of his main concerns in the first *Critique* is with the objects of traditional metaphysics, which cannot, he thinks, be given in intuition,

Both authors contributed equally to this chapter.

¹ Kant employs several different notions of cognition, some broader (e.g. KrV A319–20/B376) and some narrower (KrV B137). For the purposes of this paper, we take cognition to consist in a determinate relation to a given object that can serve as a ground for knowledge in the sense Kant defines in the Canon to the first *Critique*.

Kant's primary focus is on whether *pure* reason's claim to synthetic a priori cognition of these objects is justified. To that end he investigates the a priori conditions that are necessary for synthetic a priori cognition, but, as a result, he does not concentrate on what further empirical conditions might be necessary (or sufficient) for the a posteriori judgments of empirical cognition. Accordingly, Kant's primary goal in the first *Critique* is not to offer a truly *comprehensive* account of cognition in general.²

Fortunately, by providing detailed discussions of many empirical features of empirical cognition, the transcripts of Kant's lectures on anthropology help to add content to the view of cognition that emerges from the first *Critique*. Since his anthropology lectures were devoted to what he calls pragmatic anthropology, which concerns "knowledge of the human being [*Menschenkenntnis*] as it is useful in society in general" (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1210), it is clear that the transcripts from these lectures will contain material that is helpful in understanding the more empirical features of Kant's account of cognition (even if Kant's explicit intent in the lectures is not to provide an account of empirical cognition as such). Thus if the first *Critique* describes a bare-bones skeleton of some of the necessary conditions of a priori cognition, the transcripts from the anthropology lectures put a healthy amount of empirical meat on the bones of his a priori account.

In this chapter, we begin, in section 1, by briefly describing Kant's conception of anthropology and the most basic distinctions he draws when invoking faculties throughout the anthropology transcripts. We then use Kant's own division of our cognitive faculties into the senses, the imagination, and the understanding as a principle of organization for the remaining sections of the paper. In section 2, we explain Kant's account of the "objective senses" (hearing, sight, and touch), and show that the sensory material provided by these senses are *empirical* conditions of experience that supplement the a priori conditions articulated in the *Critique*. In section 3, we describe some of the central details of Kant's account of the imagination, focusing on his distinction between wit and the power of judgment and on the law of association he endorses. In section 4, we describe Kant's account of both the deficiencies of the mind and the perfection of cognition (with respect to its object, its subject, and its relations to other cognitions).³ We think that the account discussed below is interesting in its own right, but

² For discussion of Kant's views of cognition in general, see Eric Watkins and Marcus Willaschek (forthcoming).

³ Though important changes take place between the first transcripts of Kant's anthropology lectures and the last ones, we refrain from making any developmental hypotheses, interesting though that may be.

we also hope that it can shed some light on Kant's theory of cognition as found in the first *Critique*. By showing how the transcendental faculties are manifested at the level of actual, concrete experience, the anthropology transcripts can help to illuminate Kant's understanding of the operations and functions of the human mind.⁴

1. The subject matter and cognitive architecture of the anthropology transcripts

For current purposes, Kant's treatment of anthropology in the transcripts is distinctive along two dimensions: (1) he is interested in what he calls "pragmatic" anthropology and (2) the explanations he provides throughout appeal to faculties that are defined in specific ways. To introduce what he means by pragmatic anthropology, Kant begins many of his anthropology lectures by introducing the idea of "knowledge of the world," or perhaps "worldly knowledge" (*Weltkenntnis*),⁵ which is often contrasted with scholastic knowledge, or knowledge of the schools (*VA-Mrongovius* 25:1209). The contrast between the two is that the latter is interested in theoretical cognition and is intended for scholars, whereas the former involves the application of theoretical cognition and is designed for society at large. Kant divides knowledge of the world into geography and anthropology on the basis of a distinction between inner and outer sense. Geography concerns objects of outer sense, which, taken together, constitute nature, whereas anthropology considers objects of inner sense, or human beings.⁶ Kant then contrasts scholastic and pragmatic anthropology, noting that the former searches for the causes of human nature in general, while the latter looks at the human constitution and attempts to apply it to situations that arise in society, where it is supposed to serve "prudence rather than erudition" (*VA-Mrongovius* 25:1211). In the various distinctions, descriptions, and explanations Kant provides throughout the anthropology lecture

⁴ Although we address, at the level of details, the relation between specific transcendental faculties of cognition and their specific empirical counterparts, we have avoided making any hypotheses about the general relationship between the transcendental and empirical operations of the mind. On this issue, see Schmidt (2008). Schmidt argues that the transcendental operations of the mind "configure" the empirical operations.

⁵ It is not entirely obvious how to translate (or understand) the term *Weltkenntnis*. Kant frequently uses the term *Erkenntnis*, which is often (though not always) translated as "cognition" (and, as seen above, has broader and narrower meanings, depending on context), and he also uses the term *Wissen*, which is typically translated as "knowledge" and is a cognate of *Wissenschaft* (science). It is not clear whether Kant would be willing to identify *Weltkenntnis* with *Wissen* or *Erkenntnis*, or to view it as a species of either one. It is clear that the standard meaning of the term *Kenntnis*, indicating acquaintance or familiarity, would be misleading in this context.

⁶ See also Kant's explanation of the distinction in the *Physical Geography* (at, e.g., PG 9:156–7).

transcripts, they seem to serve the students as a kind of clear, analytical framework for assessing the different kinds of situation they are likely to encounter in the world and are thus pragmatic in a very broad sense.

The content of the transcripts of Kant's *Lectures on Anthropology*, like that of the published *Anthropology*, is divided into sections according to the three faculties that he attributes to human beings: the cognitive faculty, the faculty of pleasure and displeasure, and the faculty of desire. His discussion of the cognitive faculty is itself divided further into sections that discuss the faculties of sensibility, imagination, and the understanding. He then distinguishes the understanding further into understanding in the narrow sense (the faculty of concepts or rules), the power of judgment (the faculty of applying rules), and reason (the faculty of the application of rules a priori that it legislates according to its own principles) (VA-Friedländer 25:537; VA-Mrongovius 25:1296). All of these distinctions are drawn in roughly the same way in the three *Critiques* such that it is clear that Kant is attempting to give an account of our (cognitive) faculties that is continuous with his own mature, official account, at the same time that he attempts to expand on it and provide some welcome empirical content.

2. The objective senses and the objects of sense

In the *Critique*, sensibility (*Sinnlichkeit*) is typically defined in terms of receptivity, or passivity, and the givenness of objects. Sensibility passively receives impressions (the sensory matter which will be formed into higher and more complex representations), and its representations (intuitions) refer immediately to the objects that are given by means of those impressions (cf. KrV A19/B33). We find a similar characterization of the faculty of sense (*Sinn*) in the anthropology transcripts. In the *Anthropologie Friedländer*, Kant claims that "the senses are that through which we directly represent things for ourselves" (VA-Friedländer 25:492), and later he claims that "the senses are the receptivity of impressions" (VA-Friedländer 25:560). In the *Anthropologie Mrongovius*, he says that "[s]ense is that through which we represent an object as present," and he analyzes the representations of sense into "the matter, [i.e.] the impressions that the objects make on us, [and] the form, [i.e.] the combination of the impressions" (VA-Mrongovius 25:1241). Thus the anthropological characterization of sensibility parallels the official doctrine of the *Critique* in these fundamental respects.⁷ However, where Kant's emphasis in the *Critique* is on the faculty of

⁷ Kant does not always seem to adhere to the distinction he draws in the first *Critique* between sensation and intuition.

sensibility in general (focusing on space and time), in the anthropological discussions his emphasis is on the nature and different functions of the individual sensory modalities. We turn now to a discussion of these.

2.1. *Objective versus subjective senses*

Kant's most basic characterization of the five (or six⁸) sensory modalities separates them into the "objective" senses and the "subjective" senses (VA-Friedländer 25:493).⁹ The objective senses are those which "affect [the body] externally" and are the "senses of intuition" (ibid.). The subjective senses, by contrast, "affect [the body] internally" and are the senses of "sensation" (ibid.). Where the objective senses yield a perception of objects, the subjective senses provide merely "a sensation of an impression" (ibid.). The representational contents of the objective and subjective senses differ accordingly: "Objective senses . . . represent to us the objects more than the way in which we are affected by them, and Subjective [senses] . . . represent to us more the way in which the objects affect us than the objects themselves" (VA-Mrongovius 25:1242). Kant consistently classifies touch, hearing, and sight as objective, and taste and smell as subjective.¹⁰

Kant is not claiming here that the objective senses yield only perceptions of objects, nor that the subjective senses yield only sensations of the current state of the subject. Rather, the senses are *more or less* objective or subjective, and Kant's characterization of each sense as objective or subjective should be understood as a *comparative* characterization; the objectivity or subjectivity of any sensory modality is *a matter of degree*. For instance, although the sensations associated with taste typically indicate merely the way I am affected by the food dissolved in my saliva, a sour taste will usually also be a reliable indicator that the food is acidic, which is a fact about the object itself, not merely its effect on me.¹¹ Likewise, although hearing will typically alert me to the existence of the object producing a sound I hear, beautiful music will direct my attention away from the cause of the sound and to my own enjoyment of it. Hence the primary (but not exclusive) function of the objective senses is to enable cognition of the objects of

⁸ In the *Anthropologie Friedländer*, Kant contrasts "the feeling of touch" (*tactus*) with "feeling in general" (*sensus*) and says that the latter is a kind of sixth sense (VA-Friedländer 25:493). In the *Anthropologie Mrongovius*, Kant distinguishes two kinds of feeling (*Gefühl*): "the feeling of pleasure and displeasure" and "the sensation of an object through touch" (VA-Mrongovius 25:1242). This sixth sense is also sometimes referred to as the "vital sense" (see VA-Mrongovius 25:1242; and A 7:154).

⁹ Cf. VA-Mrongovius 25:1245. This distinction remains in Kant's curriculum through the publication of the official *Anthropology* (cf. A 7:154).

¹⁰ See VA-Friedländer 25:493; VA-Mrongovius 25:1242; and A 7:154.

¹¹ This is our example, not Kant's.

outer sense, and the primary (but not exclusive) function of the subjective senses is to represent the way outer objects affect me.

Now as the student of Kant's transcendental philosophy is well aware, one of Kant's primary concerns is to explain the conditions on the possibility of experience, which is a kind of cognition. Thus one would naturally be curious to know how Kant's anthropological (and empirical–psychological) account of how the various objective senses enable cognition of objects augments his transcendental account of the a priori conditions on the possibility of such perception. The account presented in the *Critique* is merely *formal*: Kant there explains the forms of cognition (sensibility and understanding) and the forms that the objects of cognition must take as a result. Although he also discusses, at least in the abstract, the need for a sensory *matter* to fill out these forms to produce actual empirical cognition (as opposed to simply the bare possibility thereof), spelling out the details of what kind of sensory matter is required lies outside the scope of the *Critique*.

Fortunately, the discussions of the individual objective senses from the anthropology transcripts – hearing, sight, and touch – flesh out this important part of the story. Specifically, corresponding to the pure forms of intuition (space and time) are sight and hearing, which allow for the representation of actual determinate spaces and times (respectively). And corresponding to the conditions on the possibility of cognizing spatiotemporal appearances as substantial (as articulated in the *Critique*'s First Analogy of Experience) is the sense of touch, which allows for the representation of an object's solidity and impenetrability, and hence its substantiality. As Kant remarks in a particularly revealing passage from the Friedländer transcript, "by feeling we cognize substances, by hearing we divide time, and by sight we divide space. Substances, space and time, however, are the three elements of outer objects" (VA-Friedländer 25:494).

We will now describe the contributions to empirical cognition made by each of the objective senses. We argue that the anthropological accounts of the various sensory modalities articulate empirical conditions on experience that supplement the transcendental conditions of the *Critique*. Where the *Critique* explains the a priori conditions that make experience *possible*, the anthropology transcripts explain various empirical conditions that make experience *actual*.

2.2. *Sight and hearing*

Kant classifies both sight (*Gesicht*) and hearing (*Hören*) as senses that allow for perception "at a distance" (VA-Friedländer 25:493). The two are

therefore said to be “mediate” senses because they do not involve the immediate presence (i.e. direct contact) of the object against the sense organ, and they require a medium for perception to occur.¹² For instance, “[w]ith hearing the object does not have an effect on me immediately, but only through the air, and I do not have an effect on it at all” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1242). The medium of vision, by contrast, is light (VA-*Friedländer* 25:594–5). With both hearing and sight, the object of perception has an (indirect) effect on me, but I do not have any reciprocal effect on it.

Sight and hearing are also both described as “noble” because these senses “make objects mutual for us” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:495). In other words, it is through sight and hearing that the objects of sense become public, and hence intersubjectively available. Nobility, like objectivity, comes in degrees and Kant ranks the senses in terms of the degree to which they make objects mutual. Sight, for instance, is nobler than hearing (VA-*Friedländer* 25:496). In the first *Critique*, “objective” is often treated as synonymous with “intersubjective,” and this might lead one to assume that objectivity and nobility amount to the same thing in the anthropology transcripts. However, this is not how Kant uses these concepts in the lectures, and the classification of the senses in terms of nobility is orthogonal to the objective/subjective classification. Smell, despite being one of the subjective senses, has a degree of nobility because “everyone will be concerned that an object might smell good to others as well” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:496). And touch, despite being one of the objective senses, “does not participate [in nobility] at all” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:496). Thus objectivity (at least as used in the anthropology lectures) is mere object-directedness, while the additional concept of nobility is required to capture the degree of intersubjectivity of sensory representations.

The objectivity and nobility of hearing and sight mark an important contribution to cognition. Because they direct the perceiver to the publicly available (“mutual”) features of objects, they make it possible to represent objects in terms of their subject-independent properties. Thus if humans lacked vision and hearing (and possessed no other “noble” senses), then objectively valid judgments about external objects would be impossible for them. In the language of the *Prolegomena*, we would not be able to establish a meaningful distinction between subjectively valid “judgments of perception” and objectively valid “judgments of experience” (cf. Prol 4:298). Without any representation of the public aspects of objects, we

¹² The only immediate sense is touch. The subjective senses – taste and smell – operate through chemical interaction (instead of the mechanical interaction of the objective senses) and they are communicated “mediately by means of salts” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1245).

could form no (empirical) concept of what things are like on their own and independent of how I am affected by them.¹³ If this analysis is correct, then the conditions on the possibility of cognition articulated and defended in the *Critique* turn out to be necessary but not sufficient, since the existence of at least one objective and noble sense providing sensations of the public features of objects is an additional necessary condition. Thus while the first *Critique* articulates the a priori and formal conditions on the possibility of experience, the anthropology transcripts reveal that Kant was also cognizant of empirical and material conditions of experience. Further empirical conditions from the anthropology transcripts will be enumerated below.

While sight and hearing have their “objectivity,” “nobility,” and “mediacy” in common, the representational contents through which they present objects differ. Although hearing is considered an objective sense because it enables the perception of objects, its primary function is the communication of thought through spoken language. Hearing does not allow for the precise determination of the location of an object in space. In general, I can at best recognize that a sound came from “over there.” Thus, “hearing does not present objects in [terms of] their shape” and so through hearing “we have no representation and concept of objects other than that an object is merely there [*da sei*]” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:493; cf. VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1242). Furthermore, since objects are (relatively) permanent and stable and “sound is temporary,” sound “does not reveal any objects [and] hence it can at best be taken as an arbitrary sign of objects” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1243). Thus hearing does not in general allow the perceiver to determine with much specificity the exact physical or spatial structure of an object, though it does reveal the existence of the object producing the sound. For this reason, hearing should be considered the least objective of the objective senses.

Nevertheless, since sound spans a stretch of time, audible sensations *fill* time. Kant took this to be significant. He remarks more than once that hearing is important insofar as it allows for the division of time

¹³ Kant’s point here bears some similarity to P. F. Strawson’s project in his influential book *Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*. Strawson sought to investigate the conditions on the possibility of “non-solipsistic consciousness” or the ability to distinguish between “states or conditions which are experiences or states of consciousness of one’s own, and those particulars which are not experiences or states of consciousness of one’s own” (Strawson (1959), 61). If our analysis of Kant’s account of nobility and objectivity is correct, then Kant has anticipated Strawson’s investigation by offering his own answer to the question of what is necessary for non-solipsistic consciousness. Without objective, noble senses that allow for the representation of the public features of objects, we would not be able to make a meaningful distinction between things that are a part of one’s own mind and things that are distinct from it.

(VA-Friedländer 25:493–4), which he identifies with one of the “elements of outer objects” (VA-Friedländer 25:494). The suggestion here is that the representational contents of sensations that persist across a duration of time (such as those given in audition) are required for the representation of determinate temporal intervals. With only the pure intuition of time (which would be empty), we could represent the *possibility* of determinate temporal intervals, but not *actual* determinate temporal intervals. Thus hearing performs the important function of marking out actual determinate times.¹⁴

In contrast with hearing, which “provides neither the shape nor concept of the object . . . sight provides no sensation, but it provides the shape” (VA-Friedländer 25:496). Sight “provides no sensation” in the sense that visual representations draw the observer’s attention almost exclusively to the shape of the object, and the fact that one is being chromatically affected (as it were) is rarely brought to the attention of the observer. This point is elaborated in the Mrongovius transcripts: “When seeing, one does not have a sensation of his own condition at all” (VA-Mrongovius 25:1243). Since the working definition of “sensation” (*Empfindung*) in the transcripts treats it as a representation of the subject’s own sensory state,¹⁵ in saying that sight is free of sensation, Kant is emphasizing that representations of sight present just the object itself, without any distorting admixture of representations of the subject.¹⁶ In other words, sight is typically completely objective in the sense defined in subsection 2.1 above. Sight’s objectivity lies precisely in this lack of sensation in the representations of sight.

It is worth emphasizing that the “objectivity” under consideration here has to do only with the representational (or “intentional”) content of the representations produced by vision (and the other objective senses). That is, the representations of these senses are *about* the object rather than the

¹⁴ Kant privileges sensations of hearing for this function, but presumably any sensory modality whose sensations last for longer than an instant (don’t they all?) would suffice. Kant indicates in the *Critique* that *all* sensations fill time (cf. KrV A143/B183).

¹⁵ This usage of *Empfindung* should be contrasted with its usage in the *Critique*. There, sensations are most frequently described as the “matter” (*Materie*) of intuition, of perception, of appearance, or of experience generally (see for instance KrV A20/B34; KrV A42/B59; KrV B207; KrV A374). In this sense of *Empfindung*, sensations are a necessary component of any empirical representation, objective or subjective. Elsewhere in the *Critique*, however, sensations are described as representations of the subject’s own sensory states (see KrV B207; and KrV A320/B376). In the anthropology lectures, Kant uses “sensation” only in this second sense. (See also [note 7](#) above.)

¹⁶ See also the published *Anthropology*: “[Sight’s] organ feels least affected (because otherwise it would not be merely sight). Thus sight comes nearer to being a *pure intuition* (the immediate representation of the given object, without admixture of noticeable sensation)” (A 7:156, original emphasis). By “pure intuition” Kant means that the representation is free of noticeable sensation, not that it is “pure” (i.e. non-empirical) in the sense of the *Critique*.

subject. This does not mean that these representations are also “objective” in the sense of accurately depicting the qualities of the objects themselves. For instance, the color of a rose, as Kant emphasizes in the *Critique*, is not a property of the rose as it is in itself,¹⁷ because the color “can appear different to every eye” (KrV A29/B45). Hence even though we typically represent colors *as* features of objects, *in fact* they are only modifications of our own sensibility. Thus we can make a distinction between (1) a representational content being *about* the properties of an object (as opposed to being about the way the subject is affected by those properties), and (2) a representational content *accurately depicting* the properties of an object (as opposed to merely being the result of the subject’s relation to the object). In general, representations of primary qualities (e.g. size and shape) will be objective in both senses, but representations of secondary qualities (e.g. color) will be objective only in the first sense.¹⁸

Even if the colors presented in visual representations are not objective in the second sense, the shapes presented in these representations surely are. As Kant remarks in the Friedländer transcripts, “shape is only the form, but color is a play of sensation” (VA-Friedländer 25:496). The representation of shape, or, as he describes it, “variousness in accordance with space” (ibid.), is the most important function of sight. Just as hearing allows for the representation of determinate, actual times, sight allows for the representation of determinate, actual spaces. Space and time, as we learn in the *Critique*, are the two forms of all external objects. Although other sensory modalities might be up to the task of marking out determinate spatial and temporal regions – for instance, Kant suggests that touch also represents shape – hearing and sight are the primary means by which we cognize determinate spaces and times.¹⁹ In general, we conclude that empirical cognition of spatiotemporal objects could not arise without *some* sensory modality that allows for the determination of actual times and *some* sensory modality that allows for the determination of actual sizes and shapes. Thus these sensory modalities are another empirical condition on experience.

¹⁷ The reference to the features of empirical objects “in themselves” should be taken in the empirical sense (as opposed to the transcendental, noumenal sense) of things in themselves (cf. KrV A29/B45).

¹⁸ On the primary/secondary quality distinction in the first *Critique*, see KrV A29/B44f. There Kant suggests that the representation of the spatial features of an object should be taken “in an empirical sense as a thing in itself,” while the colors of a thing do not because they “can appear different to every eye in regard to color.” Kant also appeals to the primary/secondary quality distinction in a different sense in the *Prolegomena* (Prol 4:289). Regarding this latter passage, see Allais (2007).

¹⁹ For discussion of Kant’s account of how blind people come to represent spatiality, see Schmidt (2008), 467.

2.3. Touch

Kant often refers to this sensory modality as “feeling” (*Gefühl*), but he makes a point to contrast “the feeling of pleasure or displeasure” from “the sensation of an object through touch [*Berührung*]” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1242).²⁰ In the *Mrongovius* transcripts he remarks that it “is the crudest [*gröbste*] sense and is closest to [being] objective. It is also the most accurate sense” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1242). Touch is “closest to objective” because in touching an object one represents the object itself, rather than its impression on the senses (i.e. it is objective in the sense defined in subsection 2.1 above). Presumably, touch is “crudest” because it is not capable of the fine-grained degree of property discrimination that sight and hearing are.²¹ Nevertheless, it is “the most accurate sense.” Kant must mean that, despite its crudity, touch is the least prone to error. I am much less likely to misjudge whether an object is present when I access it through touch than when I access it through sight or hearing because the latter are more prone to misrepresentation and illusion.

In addition to its honor as “most objective,” touch makes an essential contribution to the empirical cognition of objects: touch is necessary for the representation of empirical objects as substances.²² In the *Anthropologie Friedländer*, Kant says, “[t]hrough touch we have cognition of substances; without this sense we would not cognize them, instead we would perceive only appearances” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:494). And in the *Anthropologie Mrongovius*, he says that touch “is the surest and the best means to acquaint oneself with the object. For without feeling and through sight alone we would not take objects to be substances, but rather made-up figures [*gemachte Figuren*]” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1242). We saw above that sight is necessary for the representation of determinate regions of space. However, it is not sufficient on its own to do more than mark out those regions of space as filled with sensory matter. Hence sight on its own can present an image of an object, but it cannot differentiate mere phantasms

²⁰ In the *Anthropologie Friedländer*, he contrasts *Gefühl* with *tactus*, saying that the former is “a general sense” and is to be identified only with *sensus* (VA-*Friedländer* 25:494). Despite the terminological inconsistency, the distinction in the two transcripts amounts to the same thing.

²¹ In the *Anthropologie Friedländer*, he elaborates this point, saying that “feeling is the crudest sense, since we feel physical things only to the extent that they are impenetrable” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:495). This seems to be an inaccurate representation of the sense of touch. We encounter more than the impenetrability of an object through touch. We also perceive its temperature, its texture, and its shape.

²² Touch should be taken to be necessary only for the representation of empirical (i.e. phenomenal) substances. I will never be able to touch God, but presumably I can still represent God as an *ens realissimum*, and thus as a substance.

and apparitions from real, persistent substances. In order for the visible sensory matter to be represented as substantial, it must be touched, or at the very least represented as tangible. Kant's illustration here is useful: "If I notice an inverted rose in a concave mirror, I see one hovering in the air. I can find out only through feeling whether it really is a rose" (VA-*Mongovius* 25:1242). The information given in visual perception is sufficient to mark out the region that a material substance *could* occupy, and perhaps in normal circumstances we make an immediate inference to a material substance *in fact* being there, but, strictly speaking, visual representations not supplemented by tactile representations are not sufficient to represent visible shapes and colors as shapes and colors of something substantial.²³

Interestingly, this aspect of Kant's anthropological account of touch intersects with part of his account of material substance in the *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science*. In a remark from the chapter on dynamics, when arguing for the necessity of an attractive force in addition to the repulsive force (which is manifested as impenetrability or solidity), Kant maintains that only the repulsive force can be sensed directly, and this only by the sense of touch. "The sense of feeling [*Gefühl*]," he writes, "provides us with the quantity and figure of something extended, and thus with the determinate concept of an object in space, which forms the basis of everything else one can say about this thing" (MAN 4:510). Although touch shares with sight the ability to distinguish "the quantity and figure of something," touch holds a monopoly on the representation of the substantiality of a thing: "This substance discloses its existence to us in no other way than through that sense whereby we perceive its impenetrability, namely, feeling, and thus only in relation to contact" (MAN 4:510).

2.4. *A priori versus empirical conditions of experience*

Kant's account of the objective senses allows us to supplement the account of the conditions on the possibility of experience provided by the first *Critique*. If we distinguish between a priori and formal conditions of experience, on the one hand, and empirical and material conditions, on the other hand, then it is clear that the spatial and temporal forms of intuition

²³ One consequence of this analysis is that the *objectivity* of a representation (i.e. its object-directedness) does not entail that *substantiality* is part of its representational content. Something can be represented as an object without being represented as a substance. An example of this would be a rainbow. When I perceive a rainbow, I take there be a phenomenon existing at a certain location in the sky, but I do not thereby also represent it as materially substantial.

and the pure concepts of the understanding that describe an object in general are a priori, formal conditions of experience. What Kant is adding in the anthropology transcripts are empirical conditions of experience. These include the existence of the objective and noble senses revealing the public features of objects, the existence of senses (hearing and sight) that can mark off divisions in space and time, and the existence of an immediate sense (touch) through which the substantiality of objects can be perceived. In short, where the conditions articulated in the *Critique* pertain to what is necessary for experience to be *possible*, the anthropology transcripts explain what is necessary for these possibilities to be *actualized*.²⁴

3. Imagination

Just as he does in the first *Critique* (KrV B151), in the anthropology transcripts Kant defines the imagination (*Einbildungskraft*) as the power of representing without the presence of the object in intuition and thinks of it as a faculty that mediates between the senses and the understanding (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1257). Kant's focus in the first *Critique* is primarily on how the figurative synthesis of the imagination is necessary for the argument of the Transcendental Deduction and on how the schemata can solve the heterogeneity problem that arises for the categories and our sensible intuition, both of which are specific to Kant's interest in a priori cognition. In the anthropology transcripts, by contrast, he makes a number of specific claims that add empirical content to his theory of the imagination. For example, Kant explores the various degrees and qualities of the imagination, which explain its intensity and weakness in particular circumstances (VA-*Friedländer* 25:514), and he notes that the imagination cannot create impressions it has not had before, though it can create "new forms" for them. Thus a person blind from birth cannot represent light or darkness (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1257), while a sighted person can combine images in various ways. Further, Kant distinguishes between productive and reproductive imagination, depending on whether one has perceived the imagined object before, and claims that the reproductive kind is involuntary and called fantasy (*Phantasie*), while the productive kind, called imagination (*Imagination*), is voluntary and especially prominent among artists. He makes a variety of observations, or rather claims, about different features of the imagination. For example, the imagination is stronger in

²⁴ We do not claim that these two lists of necessary conditions are jointly sufficient. Other empirical conditions of experience might be required, including, for instance, the associative powers of the imagination that allow for the representation of causal relations (discussed below).

the evening than in the morning, and it can be used to help one give up coffee, for if one eats rhubarb while drinking coffee, the imagination will then call rhubarb to mind whenever one drinks coffee in the future (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1260). On the basis of the remarks he makes about the imagination, Kant then distinguishes fantasists, dreamers, enthusiasts, and visionaries as different kinds of people whose imagination has departed from normalcy.

Kant also develops a specific account of reproductive image formation according to the law of association of representations (VA-*Friedländer* 25:512). Association is based, he claims, on three elements: accompaniment, contiguity, and relation. Accompaniment concerns the temporal relation of simultaneity and succession. If we see smoke, we think of fire since it occurs at the same time. Accompaniment, which makes causal reasoning possible, “is the first and greatest degree of association” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:513). Contiguity is similar to accompaniment, except that it concerns space rather than time; unity of time (accompaniment) and unity of space (contiguity) are thus parallel principles of association. Kant is much less clear about what exactly constitutes relation, but he mentions “similarity” and “derivation” as instances of it. He also notes that the first two elements pertain to the association of sensibility, whereas relation pertains to that of the understanding. As a result, insofar as Kant views derivation as involving the understanding and causation (VA-*Friedländer* 25:513), his departure from Hume is in evidence, since for Hume our representation of causation is based exclusively on the senses and imagination and not on the understanding. Though Kant refers, in the first *Critique*, to the imagination as being responsible for empirical associations, he does not cite any specific laws nor claim that it is necessary for cognition, making it difficult to know whether he is open to accepting Hume’s account of the imagination.

Whereas in the first *Critique* Kant seems to view the workings of the imagination as a “blind though indispensable function of the soul” (KrV A78/B103), in the anthropology transcripts he provides some discussion of how the imagination and its representations relate to the understanding. Though it is difficult to discern a clear and consistent picture from the various transcripts, he seems to think that we have one faculty for discovering or comparing similar representations, namely wit (which is sometimes translated as ingenuity), and another power for comparing dissimilar representations, namely the power of judgment (*UrtheilsKraft*) (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1262). Wit is thus responsible for finding the universal for a set of given particulars, while the power of judgment seeks the particulars that fall

under a universal.²⁵ Kant then goes on to provide a range of observations about these two faculties. Wit is “fleeting,” while the power of judgment is “slow and serious” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1263). Wit “has inspirations and the power of judgment turns them into insight” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:517). Kant also provides a taxonomy of deficient forms of wit and the power of judgment, such that the former without the latter is silliness, while one who simply lacks the latter is stupid. One can imagine the amusement Kant's students must have experienced in hearing such descriptions.

4. Understanding

One of the more distinctive contributions to the pragmatic dimension of anthropology that can be found only in the anthropology transcripts is Kant's detailed description of the various “imperfections of the mind” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1302 ff.). Kant distinguishes between mental frailty, which one is born with, and mental illness, which concerns merely the state of one's mind and the improper use of one's cognitive powers, which are otherwise good in themselves. He notes that it is hard to distinguish between a disturbed mind, which acts against established rules, and either a silly person or a fool. Idiocy, which is a mental frailty that consists in an innate inability to use one's cognitive powers, and simplemindedness, which is a lack of the power of judgment (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1271), result from an inability to check one's judgment against that of others (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1303). Dementia, insanity, and lunacy are distinct kinds of disturbance, where dementia that comes from seeing either an internal or an external light is either fanaticism or spirit-seeing (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1304). But there are errors of our higher cognitive powers that do not count as disturbances, such as folly, silliness, and foolishness (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1305). Folly is the deviation from the rule of reason through the seduction of the inclinations, whereas foolishness involves having too great a sense of one's worth and preferring evil over good.

Another idea that is new to the anthropology transcripts concerns the perfection of cognition.²⁶ Kant mentions the logical perfection of cognition only once in the first *Critique* (at KrV A839/B866), but without explaining what it is and using it only negatively to distinguish prior conceptions of philosophy from his own. In the *Friedländer* and *Mrongovius* transcripts, by contrast, Kant provides a detailed account of the perfection

²⁵ See also the published *Anthropology* for Kant's remarks on wit and the power of judgment (A 7:201).

²⁶ Kant discusses the issue in his logic lectures as well. See VL-*Philippi* 24:360–363 and 24:517.

of cognition. In the *Anthropologie Mrongovius*, he begins by considering it in three respects:

- (a) With regard to the object, and here it is truth, magnitude, and distinctness. This is logical.
- (b) With regard to the subject; here it is ease, liveliness, and interest; this is aesthetic.
- (c) With regard to the connection of cognitions with one another; here it is diversity, order, and unity. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1224)²⁷

Let us consider these three respects of the perfection of cognition in turn, starting with the “logical” features of cognition, namely truth, magnitude, and distinction.²⁸

First, Kant calls truth “the greatest perfection of cognitions” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1224) since it is an essential feature of cognition, and he contrasts it with semblance (*Schein*).²⁹ Though one might be tempted to favor error in certain cases so as to be able to draw utility from it, that is never acceptable, Kant argues, because “the utility of errors is only accidental and can quickly cease, and it is also always far too small to outweigh the harms they bring about” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1226). Kant does not define truth in the *Anthropologie Mrongovius*, but, interestingly, he refers to the approbation of other human beings as the “popular criterion” of truth, which he explicitly distinguishes from its “logical” criterion, which is presumably the adequacy of a representation to its object (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1225).

Second, Kant’s discussion of the magnitude of cognition is relatively brief, but the main point he emphasizes is that “the proper magnitude of cognition is based on the comprehensiveness of its application, not on its amount” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1227, translation modified). That is, it is not the sheer number of cognitions that matters, but rather how useful they are for us, whether it be by extending our cognition (as opposed to simply repeating trivial cognition) or by cultivating our understanding (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1228). He also notes that the practical value of cognition

²⁷ The *Anthropologie Friedländer* translates *Leichtigkeit* as “facility” rather than “ease.”

²⁸ In the *Anthropologie Friedländer*, Kant refers not only to truth, certainty, and distinctness, but also to the “size, completeness, and exactness of cognition” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:483). Certainty does not refer to any special subjective state that would contrast with probability, but is rather equivalent to truth. (For the sake of comparison, consider that Baumgarten defines the certainty of a thing as the possibility of a clear cognition of its truth.) Size is presumably a synonym for magnitude. Completeness and exactness are further interesting features of the object of the perfection of cognition that Kant does not clarify.

²⁹ In other writings, Kant seems to maintain the possibility of “false” cognition, suggesting that cognition can be either wholly true or partially true and partially false, denying only that cognition can be entirely false.

depends on our being able to exercise our advantages on the basis of it (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1228). Thus, whereas the first *Critique* sets as its epistemic goal reason's self-cognition or cognition of the unconditioned (or some combination thereof), the anthropology transcripts are directed toward how cognition can be useful to us.

Third, Kant claims that the distinctness³⁰ of cognition is of two kinds:

1. scholastic distinctness, where the work and the process through which the distinctness is produced must be evident; and 2. Popular distinctness, where just the opposite must happen and the labor must not be conspicuous at all. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1227)

Distinctness both presupposes and is preceded by order (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1227, 25:482), while it leads to truth and certainty (VA-*Friedländer* 25:483).

Regarding the perfection of cognition in relation to the subject, Kant asserts that ease (or facility), liveliness, and interest are its defining features. In short, the easier it is to acquire a cognition, and the more lively and more interesting it is for the subject, the more perfect the cognition is, subjectively speaking. He suggests that novelty, diversity, and appearance (*Einkleidung*) are what make cognitions more perfect in this respect, especially insofar as they allow our minds "to be influenced by moral principles" (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1228). Since the first *Critique* is nearly silent on these issues, the anthropology transcripts go well beyond what the first *Critique* has to offer on this question, even if they focus more on the pragmatic interests that are at the heart of a pragmatic anthropology and, as a result, are less focused on straightforwardly epistemic interests.³¹

The *Anthropologie Mrongovius* cites diversity, order, and unity as defining features of the relation of cognitions to each other with respect to the perfection of cognition, while the *Anthropologie Friedländer* mentions association and contrast as well. It is unfortunate that Kant does not devote

³⁰ Kant does not define distinctness in the anthropology lectures, but it is such a common phrase that he may not have thought it necessary. Leibniz thinks we have a distinct perception when we can explain the marks it has, whereas Baumgarten thinks that we have such a perception when we can distinguish its marks.

³¹ We would go so far as to suggest that the aesthetic aspect of the perfection of a cognition is not an epistemic feature of the cognition at all. For the fact that a cognition can be understood with ease does not entail that the cognition has a firm, rational basis (which requires that the cognition also possess objective, logical perfection). After all, many false beliefs are seductive in their simplicity and straightforwardness. Since in general the degree to which a cognition possesses aesthetic perfection does not tell us anything about whether the cognition also possesses epistemic justification (logical perfection), aesthetic perfection is not an epistemic aspect of cognition, but rather merely a pragmatic one.

more resources to explaining, for example, what exactly order is or the different ways in which unity and diversity contribute to the perfection of cognition.³² Though he remarks that order is a condition for distinctness and that order must prevail in both our thought and our action, he does not go into detail on what constitutes order (beyond stating that order requires a rule). Instead, he limits himself to making miscellaneous remarks about it (concerning, e.g., the order found in gardens or the prevalence of order in Germans and its absence among the English) (VA-*Friedländer* 25:482). What is especially lacking is any explicit connection to the kinds of relation among cognitions that the first *Critique* envisions, such as systematicity.

Kant identifies error and ignorance as the opposites of the perfection of cognition (VA-*Friedländer* 25:484).³³ Ignorance is a mere privation of cognition that is due to passivity or laziness (e.g. in failing to pass judgment on an object), whereas error results from an act of the understanding (and on the basis of obscure representations, i.e. representations of which one is not conscious)³⁴ rather than sensibility, which does not pass judgment at all and thus cannot err.³⁵ Thus, ironically, experimentation “is often the mother of errors” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:484). Paradoxes are cognitions that appear strange and one who issues paradoxes is “a daredevil” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:484) because of the exposure to the possibility of winning and losing. Interestingly, Kant’s position in the anthropology transcripts is thus somewhat different from the first *Critique*, which is primarily, but not exclusively, concerned with avoiding the error in metaphysics that is occasioned by transcendental illusion, since in several passages in the first *Critique* Kant attributes the source of error to sensibility and its influence on the understanding (e.g., KrV A294/B350).

5. Conclusion

What the preceding discussion shows is that Kant’s anthropological accounts of the faculties of sense, imagination, and understanding help to illuminate how Kant understands the manifestation of these faculties in concrete, actual, empirical cognition, thereby supplementing the transcendental account presented in the *Critique*. Where the *Critique* explains the necessary, a priori structures of cognition, the anthropology transcripts

³² For discussion of this issue, see Watkins (2013).

³³ At VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1224 Kant sets error and ignorance in opposition to truth, but given truth’s relation to cognition, there is no contradiction here.

³⁴ At VA-*Friedländer* 25:516 Kant explains in some detail how ingenuity is the cause of error.

³⁵ Kant presents an extensive “apology” for sensibility in the published *Anthropology* (A 7:143–6).

explain the contingent, empirical modes in which the faculties operate in everyday cognition. For instance, the *Critique* informs us of the essential forms of human cognition and reminds us that these forms will lie inert without a sensory matter to fill them out. The anthropology transcripts, by contrast, explain in some detail what sensory matter can do: “objective” senses are necessary for the object-directedness of cognition; “noble” senses are required for the intersubjectivity of our cognitions; and an “immediate” sense is required for the cognition of an object as substantial. The *Critique* tells us that we must apply concepts relating associated events in terms of rule-governed laws in order to represent them as cause and effect. The anthropology transcripts, however, tell us how the imagination contributes to this process by initially establishing the associations between events. The *Critique* tells us that we achieve cognition of objects when we make judgments in accordance with objectively valid rules and concepts. The anthropology transcripts perform the pragmatic task of explaining the different ways in which the understanding can be perfected, and also how it can fall into deficiency. The empirical elaborations of Kant’s theory of cognition found in the anthropology transcripts are therefore a valuable resource for attaining a fuller understanding of Kant’s larger project.

The anthropology of cognition and its pragmatic implications

Alix Cohen

The aim of this chapter is to bring to light the anthropological dimension of Kant's account of cognition as it is developed in the *Lectures on Anthropology*. I will argue that Kant's anthropology of cognition develops along two complementary lines. On the one hand, it studies nature's intentions for the human species – the 'natural' dimension of human cognition. On the other hand, it uses this knowledge to help us realise our cognitive purposes – the 'pragmatic' dimension of human cognition. Insofar as it is intended for us as embodied human agents whose cognition takes place in the empirical world, it is concerned with the knowledge of the natural subjective conditions that help or hinder our cognition. Therefore, far from portraying human beings as disembodied pure minds, Kant's account not only acknowledges the empirical, contingent and messy features of our cognition, it also helps us become better, more efficient knowers.

Yet the idea that Kant's anthropology of cognition has a pragmatic dimension turns out to be problematic. For whilst pragmatic anthropology is defined as 'the investigation of what he as a free-acting being makes of himself, or can and should make of himself' (A 7:119), by contrast with acting, cognising seems to be beyond the realm of voluntary action. However, I will show that Kant's account of cognition makes room for a form of epistemic control that is sufficient to account for the possibility of its pragmatic dimension. I will conclude by drawing the implications of my interpretation for our overall understanding of Kant's account of cognition.

1. Nature's intentions for human cognition

As Kant often notes in his anthropological works, there is a great variation amongst human beings' cognitive talents – there are the great geniuses who 'take new paths and open new prospects', the mechanical minds who advance 'slowly on the rod and staff of experience', the universal mind who 'grasps all the various sciences', the superficial mind 'who knows the

Table 5.1. *Varieties of understanding* (VA-Friedländer 25:538–44)

Superior understanding	Inferior understanding
Adroit (swift and ingenious)	Obtuse (slow and oblivious to fine differences)
Common (judges concretely)	Stupid (lack of natural understanding)
Correct (originates concepts)	Simpleminded (lack of natural understanding)
Mature (guided by another)	Immature (without another's guidance)

titles of everything but not the contents', the architectonic mind who 'methodically examines the connection of all the sciences and how they support one another', the natural minds who think 'out for themselves', and the gigantic erudite mind who misses 'the eye of true philosophy' (A 7:226–7).¹ Although for Kant transcendental structures are common to all human beings (and some even to all rational beings), their empirical expression takes many different forms within what is generally called 'the mind': 'Under the mind, one thinks of the ability to think for oneself, and this includes sound understanding, and the faculty and possession of a correct power of judgment' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1308).² For instance, Table 5.1 presents the remarkable diversity of cognitive abilities afforded by the empirical realisations of the transcendental faculty of understanding.

Other types of cognitive variations amongst human beings include variations in the following empirical abilities: self-consciousness, the ability to foresee and remember, the ability to carry out extended logical inferences; developmental variations: cognitive development, variations over time within the lifespan of an individual; and cultural variations: variations in cognitive cultures, historical environment and geographical setting.³

¹ See also 'Minds differ greatly in their ability to answer all three of these questions', 'What do I want? (asks understanding). What does it matter? (asks the power of judgment). What comes of it? (asks reason)' (A 7:227–8).

² As Schmidt has shown, 'These transcendental structures are expressed within the subjectivity of an empirical human individual as the configuration of his or her self-consciousness, external senses, inner sense, imagination, and understanding as epistemic faculties. However, these faculties also have an empirical operation in each human being, in response to specific intuitions, and these empirical operations reflect the differences among individuals in their experiences, capacities, and talents' (Schmidt (2008), 472). Contrast with Catherine Wilson's claim that 'Kant was incapable of registering particularities of mentality other than negatively': 'either human reason and action are to be discussed in extra-empirical terms, or human cultural, psychological and physical diversity are assessed as departures from an idealized and dematerialized norm' (Wilson (1997), 264–5).

³ Respectively in A 7:130–4, 161–2, 182–9, 227, 127–8, 131–40, 162–5, 226, 311–20, 321–33 and 226.

Whilst there is no space to discuss the detail of these variations here, the aim of this section is to focus on their cause and function. According to Kant, the cognitive diversity that human beings exhibit is to be attributed to nature's intentions for the human species: 'nature must have furnished the human being with this [cognitive talents and gifts]' (A 7:220). To make sense of this claim, we must begin by understanding nature's purpose behind human beings' diversity in general: 'From various circumstances . . . we can discover certain predispositions from time to time and infer from them what nature's goal for humanity is' (VA-*Pillau* 25:839). As I will argue, the diversity of human beings' cognitive talents should be interpreted as nature's means to secure the cognitive survival and progress of the species.

Kant's account of nature's intentions for the human species has been the object of numerous debates. As is well known, he often portrays nature as having providential aspects that allow human beings to fulfil their moral destiny: it 'strives to give us an education that makes us receptive to purposes higher than those that nature itself can provide', and in particular 'the subject of morality . . . the *final purpose* of creation to which all of nature is subordinated' (KU 5:433–6, translation modified). Whilst Kant's account of moral teleology is familiar, what is less so is that in his anthropological works, he also portrays nature as aiming at the preservation of the human species and the full development of its capacities: since 'in nature everything is designed to achieve its greatest possible perfection', 'Nature has also stored into her economy such a rich treasure of arrangements for her particular purpose, which is nothing less than the maintenance of the species' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:694, A 7:310).⁴ A number of human characteristics, including cognitive aptitudes, are thus defined as being determined, at least partly, according to nature's intentions for the species: 'Innate to human nature are germs which develop and can achieve the perfection for which they are determined' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:694). From the publication of the *Observations* (1764) through the *Lectures on Anthropology* all the way to the *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* (1798), these germs (*Keime*), and natural predispositions more generally (*Anlagen*), are classified under four categories: temperament, gender, nation and race. As shown in Table 5.2, each type within these categories is the means to the realization of a particular purpose that contributes to the realization of nature's overall purpose for the human

⁴ For a detailed discussion of Kant's account of nature's intentions for the human species, see Cohen (2009a), Chapter 5, section 1.

Table 5.2. *Human types and nature's purposes*

Criterion	Definition	Type	Nature's purpose
Gender	Sex	Male, female	Reproduction and preservation of the human species
Temperament	Constitution of the body	Sanguine, melancholic, choleric, phlegmatic	Diversity of human character (leading to social antagonism) which secures civil peace
Race	Hereditary transmitted features	White, Negro, Hindu, Hunnish–Mongolian–Kalmuck	Diversity of biological character so as to be suited for all climates
Nation	Civil whole united through common descent	French, English, German, Italian, etc.	Diversity of national character (leading to external war) which secures international peace

species.⁵ This purpose is twofold: on the one hand, the species' progress is accomplished through diversity amongst human beings, which generates conflicts that lead to the development of their capacities. On the other hand, its survival is secured because conflicts need to be regulated by civil laws, which leads to peaceful cohabitation.

First, the function of the natural differences between the members of the human species, whether in terms of race, temperament, gender or nationality, is to cause an antagonism that generates the development of their capacities – what Kant usually calls 'unsociable sociability' (Idea 8:20):

there is a principle of society and of sociability in the human being, but on the other hand also a principle of unsociability and separation of society. Here both principles collide with one another, which is, however, wisely arranged by the Creator . . . This is the Creator's special combination and separation, from which the multiplicity arises, and from which the complete perfection of the human race must afterwards be derived. (VA-Friedländer 25:586–7)⁶

For instance, the diversity of temperaments is one of the means nature uses to generate conflict between human beings. Temperaments clash with

⁵ I have argued for this claim in Cohen (2006). For an exposition of the evolution of Kant's account of human characteristics in the *Lectures on Anthropology*, see Zammuto's contribution in this volume.

⁶ See also 'The means nature employs in order to bring about the development of human beings' natural predispositions is their antagonism in society' (Idea 8:20). For a compelling account of the concept of unsociable sociability, see Wood (1991).

each other: the sanguine is opposed to the melancholic, the choleric to the phlegmatic, and temperaments of feeling are opposed to temperaments of activity (see *VA-Menschenkunde* 25:1159; *A* 7:287). Their antagonism leads them to strive to outdo each other, thus creating the conditions for the development of their natural predispositions by ensuring that they cultivate their capacities. In contrast, the Arcadian shepherd or the South Sea Islander did not confront the problem of antagonism and as a result failed to develop their talents. By leading to the progress of civilisation, unsocial sociability is thus a decisive driving force in the development of human beings' natural dispositions:

Without this unsociability there would never have arisen a firm civil association, but at most only the arcadian life of a shepherd, i.e. a life full of laziness with the best attitudes, whereby the human being would never be perfected or cultivated and would not be more esteemed than any other animal species. (*VA-Mrongovius* 25:1422)⁷

Yet the force of antagonism needs to be regulated if human beings are to avoid self-destruction. It is the means to this regulation, peaceful civil society, that allows them to secure their survival in a way that is compatible with their ongoing progress:

unsociability drove human beings into the state where one strove for the belongings of others and thereby came into collision with others, and because of this they were required to elect to adopt a commanding head and in this way to bring the systematic into the civil condition . . . The civil state is therefore the only condition in which all the natural predispositions of the human being can be developed. (*VA-Mrongovius* 25:1423; see also *VA-Friedländer* 25:586; and *VA-Pillau* 25:845)

As a result, human beings' diversity is nature's means to secure both their survival and their progress by compelling them to cultivate their capacities whilst creating the conditions of their peaceful cohabitation: 'The great masterpiece that nature has striven to bring forth through the perfect development of the natural predispositions is the perfect, civil constitution or its agreement with the ends of humanity' (*VA-Mrongovius* 25:1425–6). On this basis, I would like to suggest that the general principle of nature just delineated can be used to account for the diversity of human beings' cognitive

⁷ The South Sea Islander 'finds himself in comfortable circumstances and prefers to give himself up to pleasure than to trouble himself with enlarging and improving his fortunate natural predispositions . . . [He] let[s] his talents rust and [is] concerned with devoting his life merely to idleness, amusement, procreation – in a word, to enjoyment' (*G* 4:423). Through the obstacles they create for each other, they are forced to work and develop their talents.

talents that this section started with. Namely, it should be interpreted as nature's means to secure the cognitive survival and progress of the species:

By means of the great difference of minds, in the way they look at exactly the same objects and at each other, and by means of the friction between them and the connection between them as well as their separation, nature produces a remarkable drama of infinite variety on the stage of observers and thinkers. (A 7:228)

First, the cognitive differences between human beings lead them to disagree with each other, which ensures the development of their cognitive capacities. Cognitive disagreements drive them to inquire further, seek new evidence and search for additional support for their beliefs in order to win arguments. Thereby, not only do they actually improve their chances of reaching true beliefs and thus cognitive agreement, more importantly, by doing so they also cultivate their cognitive talents. Second, to safeguard cognitive exchanges in spite of ongoing disagreements, they have to be regulated, and the most efficient means of doing so is by agreeing on procedures that allow their co-existence. Common epistemic standards make it possible for their claims, methods and inquiries to be not only evaluated by others but compared to each other. Whilst these procedures may not actually settle disagreements, they provide an epistemic framework within which they can cohabit peacefully. As a result, nature, which 'has arranged nothing in vain' (VP 9:456), can be seen as using the cognitive diversity amongst human beings to secure not only the survival but more importantly the progress of the species towards its cognitive perfection.

However, if cognitive progress is nature's purpose for human beings, the function of their cognitive weaknesses remains to be accounted for. For one may be tempted to think that it would be best realised if they were all endowed with flawless intellects. Instead, as shown in [Tables 5.3–5.5](#), as well as having numerous cognitive strengths, human beings are naturally endowed with a variety of cognitive weaknesses that are associated with their temperament, nationality and gender.⁸ Nature has chosen to associate most human types with their own brand of cognitive flaws (apart from, perhaps, the masculine type, which seems to be immune from them) because their respective cognitive strengths and weaknesses are intended to

⁸ I choose to leave out the case of races since it is problematic for a number of reasons. In particular, some races seem to lack basic cognitive capacities. For instance, the Hindus 'never raise it up to abstract concepts' (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1187), whilst 'insensitive Americans [have] no prospects; even the people of Mexico and Peru cannot be cultivated' and 'self-possessed Indians . . . can progress in art but not in sciences and enlightenment' (Reflexion 1520 [15:877–8]). For a discussion of Kant's account of race, see Cohen (2009a), 38–40; Larrimore (1999); and Eze (1995).

Table 5.3. *Cognitive disparities between temperaments*^a

Temperaments	Strengths	Weaknesses
Sanguine	Popular, witty, lively	Trivial, thoughtless, disorderly
Melancholic	Profound, original, serious	Obscure, dogmatic, obstinate, punctilious
Choleric	Methodical, precise, keen-witted, orderly	Incorrect, doesn't bear contradiction, dogmatic
Phlegmatic	Sweeping, talented imitator	Laborious, superficial, procrastinator, sluggish

^a VA-Friedländer 25:641, 25:644–7 and VA-Mrongovius 25:1237, 25:1373–6.

Table 5.4. *Cognitive disparities between nations*^a

Nations	Strengths	Weaknesses
French	Daring, inspired, witty	Risk-taking, superficial
German	Methodical, orderly,	Pedant, imitator, lacking judgment to apply rule
English	Insightful, good judgment	Disorderly
Russian	Good apprentice	Immature understanding

^a VA-Friedländer 25:483–5, 25:517, 25:542–3, 25:547, 25:647, 25:659; and VA-Mrongovius 25:1264, 25:1296, 25:1301.

Table 5.5. *Cognitive variations between genders*^a

Gender	Strengths	Weaknesses
Feminine	Shrewd, good at investigating other people, fine in assessing means, talent for ratiocinating in the household	Immature about purposes, delicate, disposed for play, not good at investigating things and objects, agrees with common opinion, lacks wisdom
Masculine	Perfect in the sciences, thinks according to principles	Nil

^a VA-Friedländer 25:543, 25:705, 25:706, 25:722; VA-Mrongovius 25:1394.

complement each other in order to form a unified whole, as exemplified by marital union:

in order for there to be a difference between the two sexes, and in order that a unity would arise from the difference, the man must have strength there where the woman has weakness, and weakness there where the woman has strength. (VA-Friedländer 25:702)

Similarly, knowledge is a collaborative task where various talents are added to the mix that is human cognition. The sanguine may have to suffer thoughtlessness to allow for his liveliness, but it is the perfect complement to the melancholic's profundity. The choleric's keen-wittedness comes together with his dogmatic tendencies, but it is the perfect complement to the phlegmatic's talent for imitation:

The talents are diverse: there is a critical talent, an historical one, a philological one, a philosophical one, a mathematical and mechanical talent, etc. Whoever is excellent in one talent, is not necessarily for that reason excellent in all of them. For the kinds of cognition involved are diverse. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1308–9)

A methodical mind such as the choleric's may not be capable of creative leaps like the sanguine, just as the reliable judgment of the English may be incapable of the inspired insights of the French. But from 'the standpoint of the great portrait of human nature' (Beo 2:227), nature has intended to realise the cognitive unity of the species by spreading out cognitive talents amongst various types of knowers:

through what means is the greatest unity and social union possible? Not through uniformity, but through difference. True union is based on the lack [of something] by one party, and possession of it by the other party. If that is now combined, then a whole of the complete, friendly union arises. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:702)

However, whilst the collaborative dimension of human knowledge accounts for the variety of cognitive strengths and weaknesses, why has nature chosen not only to create obtuse, stupid, simpleminded or immature minds, but also to make clear minds 'fairly common', acute power of judgment 'a greater rarity', and inventive judgment 'very rare' (A 7:227–8)? Surprisingly perhaps, Kant approves of the fact that great minds are in short supply: 'very few human beings think this way [well-grounded thinking, which is the finest mode of thought], which is also actually good' (VA-*Busolt* 25:1482). For nature cannot count on people having the right kind of principles, whether theoretical or practical:

There are very few people who conduct themselves in accordance with principles, which is on the whole good, since it is so easy to err with these principles, and then the ensuing disadvantage extends all the further, the more general the principle is and the more steadfast the person who has set it before himself is. (Beo 2:227)

Nature can more reliably attribute the finest minds to a chosen few and assign the rest a supportive role in the equilibrium of the species – and this

is true of cognition as well as more generally. The progress of cognition is only a small, albeit important, part of the overall progress of the species. Whilst it is accomplished most notably by great minds such as Newton, Linnaeus or Galileo, cognitively weaker minds carry out other dimensions of human progress through their own brand of skills:

Genius can be opposed to the mechanical mind. Genius creates epochs; however, the mechanical mind is still more useful, since it creates regular order. A mechanical mind is commonplace. Genius appears to be based on a kind of disproportion in the cognitive power. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1312)

Human beings have a variety of needs beyond cognitive ones, and they can be best addressed by those who may lack cognitive skills but excel in other domains. Different talents, or lack thereof, fulfil different functions in nature's scheme so that what looks like a weakness at the level of an individual turns out to be a strength at the level of the species: 'the greatest ills arise when one thinks consistently with false principles. They nonetheless remain of great importance' (VA-*Busolt* 25:1482). For instance, as Kant writes in the case of imperfections due to gender:

We now come to an instance [the difference of the two sexes] where very many apparent imperfections, which have their basis in nature, appear to us, and where philosophy must be employed in order to see that these imperfections are purposive and have to do with nature. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:697)

Since we should 'expect nothing in nature and its laws but what is purposive in the whole' (KU 5:379), nature's seemingly counter-productive distribution of cognitive strengths and weaknesses is the means to its overall aim, the progress of human cognition.

2. The pragmatic dimension of Kant's anthropology of cognition

However, the realisation of nature's aim requires more than the mere existence of the diversity of human talents; these talents need to be cultivated, and it is our responsibility to do so above and beyond the effects of natural antagonism:

nature has after all placed the germs in these plants, and it is merely a matter of proper sowing and planting that these germs develop in the plants. The same holds true with human beings. Many germs lie within humanity, and now it is our business to develop the natural dispositions proportionally and to unfold humanity from its germs and to make it happen that the human being reaches his vocation. (VP 9:445)

According to Kant, we have to develop, cultivate and strengthen our natural capacities, as expressed in the maxim 'Cultivate your powers of mind and body so that they are fit to realise any ends you might encounter' (MS 6:392–3).⁹ We not only can but ought to cultivate our minds in some way, and this is so in spite of the fact that, as I have shown, we have no control over the kind of cognitive talents we are naturally endowed with.

Rather than leaving us alone with this task, Kant's lectures on anthropology provide the empirical knowledge we need to succeed and reach our vocation. Whilst nature creates our dispositions according to the purposes it sets for us, in order to realize our perfection we need to know how to best develop and utilize them. In this sense, Kant's anthropology of cognition develops along two complementary lines. On the one hand, as I have spelt out in the preceding section, it studies nature's purposes for the human species – the natural dimension of human cognition. On the other hand, it uses this knowledge to help us realise our cognitive vocation – the pragmatic dimension of human cognition. This pragmatic dimension consists in spelling out the natural subjective conditions that help or hinder our cognition, thereby enabling us to become more cognitively efficacious. To illustrate this claim, I will examine the case of human temperaments.

Since, as already suggested, each type of temperament comes with its own brand of cognitive strengths and weaknesses, the knowledge of our temperament is a crucial help to the progress of our cognition. It enables us not only to be conscious of the pitfalls we face, but also to know how best to use our strengths and improve upon our weaknesses.¹⁰ For instance, as Kant writes:

The question thus is, what is better, to carry out one's work in a short time, in order to have the remaining time entirely for leisure, or to carry out the same work very gradually over a long time, without having time left over for leisure? The difference is based on people's temperaments. (VA-Friedländer 25:488)

⁹ See also 'the human being has a duty to cultivate the crude predispositions of his nature, by which the animal is first raised into the human being. It is therefore a duty in itself. But this duty is a merely ethical one, that is, a duty of wide obligation' (MS 6:391–2). Being a wide duty, it can be realised in many different ways, and it is up to us to choose the form and the extent it should take, for 'no rational principle prescribes specifically *how* far one should go in cultivating one's capacities (in enlarging or correcting one's capacity for understanding, i.e., in acquiring knowledge or skill)' (MS 6:392). Note that the limits and aims of the cultivation of the mind remain open-ended insofar as it is 'not possible to determine what degree is required for the average of the sound understanding and sound reason, and of all the powers of mind' (VA-Friedländer 25:548).

¹⁰ See for instance VA-Friedländer 25:522, VA-Mrongovius 25:1275, and A 7:186.

First, negatively, since depending on our temperament we have the tendency to make certain kinds of error, have weak capacities or even lack certain powers (see Table 5.3), knowing our temperament can make our cognitive endeavours more reliable by pointing to potential pitfalls. The awareness of our cognitive weaknesses thus enables us to be more responsive to them and thereby less likely to fail or err. It reveals domains where our temperament is pointing in the direction of error (for instance, the melancholic is dogmatic), and, conversely, domains where our temperament is pointing away from error (for instance, the choleric is precise). On the basis of this knowledge, the melancholic should be mindful of the fact that he might be blind to other points of view, whilst the choleric can safely rely on the details of his calculations. Similarly, since the sanguine is witty and lively of spirit but lacks profundity, he should be attentive to the fact that his cognitive endeavours will require ‘more investigation and seriousness’ (VA-*Friedländer* 25:641, 25:644–7; and VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1237, 25:1373–6). Or to take an example that Kant is particularly keen on, people’s capacity for memory will exhibit different strengths and weaknesses depending on their temperament:¹¹ ‘Sanguine people have an adroit and vivid memory, phlegmatic people have a slow and lasting (*tenax*) memory. Choleric people have a memory that is faithful but does not grasp easily (*non capax*). Melancholics have a vast and faithful memory’ (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1276). On this basis, the phlegmatic should not rely on memories that he acquired too quickly, whilst the melancholic can. Taking account of it in their cognitive endeavours will make them more efficient, more reliable and generally more successful.

Second, positively, being aware of our temperament is helpful to determine the course of action that is best for our cognition: which talent needs cultivating, which capacity needs improving, which endeavour we should engage in and which we should avoid. For instance, since the melancholic, whilst profound and serious, lacks a certain ‘liveliness of the spirit’ (VA-*Friedländer* 25:641), he should avoid disciplines that require it, such as scientific popularisation.¹² By contrast, the sanguine is particularly

¹¹ Famously, it is the example he uses to illustrate the purpose of pragmatic anthropology in the *Anthropology*’s introduction: ‘if he uses perceptions concerning what has been found to hinder or stimulate memory in order to enlarge it or make it agile, and if he requires knowledge of the human being for this, then this would be a part of anthropology with a pragmatic purpose, and this is precisely what concerns us here’ (A 7:119).

¹² ‘He who determines his horizon aesthetically seeks to arrange science according to the taste of the public, i.e., to make it *popular*, or in general to attain only such cognitions as may be universally communicated, and in which the class of the unlearned, too, find pleasure and interest’ (VL-*Jäsche* 24:40–1, original emphasis).

well suited to it since he is lively and witty. Moreover, since certain temperaments have the tendency to weaken the use of particular capacities, specific cognitive measures can be taken to strengthen them. For instance, since choleric temperaments are more prone to passions than others, Kant recommends that they refine them so as to improve their capacity for self-control. Similarly, phlegmatics should work on their short-term memory by recording little and striving to remember many things, whilst choleric should develop their speed by using the understanding to help remember topics and frameworks (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1275).

Needless to say, I could list many other examples from Kant's *Lectures on Anthropology*. But I believe that what I have argued so far suffices to conclude that the anthropological knowledge of temperaments, and of the empirical features of human cognition more generally, is essential to the successful realisation of our cognitive endeavours.¹³ Of course, it does not entail that we cannot possibly realise them without it, but rather that this knowledge enables us to be more efficient and reliable knowers. However, as I will discuss in the following section, the idea that Kant's anthropology of cognition has a pragmatic dimension turns out to be problematic.

3. The condition of possibility of the pragmatic dimension of Kant's anthropology of cognition

As exemplified by my account of temperaments in the preceding section, Kant's conception of anthropology is literally practical: since one 'calls all practical knowledge of the human being "pragmatic" insofar as it serves to fulfill our overall aims', 'Anthropology is thus a pragmatic knowledge of what results from our nature' (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:855–6, VA-*Friedländer* 25:471).¹⁴ It comprises advice, recommendations, counsels, guidance, warnings and even admonitions as to how to develop and apply our capacities and skills in the most efficient ways, including cognitive ones. In particular, it identifies the different types of cognitive derangement that

¹³ For a sceptical take on the usefulness of these typological descriptions, see Zammito's contribution: 'it was not clear how much value in the world these typologies might have had for his students' (p. 239).

¹⁴ 'The second part of knowledge of the world is knowledge of human beings, who are considered inasmuch as their knowledge is of interest to us in life. Therefore human beings are not studied in speculative terms, but pragmatic, in the application of their knowledge according to rules of prudence, and this is anthropology' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:470). See also VA-*Pillau* 25:733; VA-*Collins* 25:9; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:853–4; and VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1209. This knowledge has an extremely broad scope: it discloses 'the sources of all the [practical] sciences, the science of morality, of skill, of human intercourse, of the way to educate and govern human beings, and thus of everything that pertains to the practical' (C 10:145).

afflict the faculties of human cognition and suggests various ways of overcoming them. For instance, it examines the decreasing, weakening and entire loss of the senses and the soul's weaknesses and illnesses with respect to its cognitive faculty.¹⁵ It recommends numerous ways of improving the use of cognitive faculties: memory, sensory perception, understanding, judgment, reason, imagination, wisdom and so on:¹⁶

The particular culture of the powers of the mind . . . includes the culture of the cognitive faculty, of the senses, of the imagination, of the memory, of the strength of attention and wit, in short what concerns the lower powers of the understanding . . . as concerns the higher powers of understanding, they include the culture of the understanding, of the power of judgment, and of reason. (VP 9:475)

It is thus one of the aims of Kant's anthropology of cognition to instruct us how to cultivate our cognitive capacities so as to make the best use of them – note that Kant repeatedly talks of 'the use of understanding and reason' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1261), 'the use of reason' (VA-*Friedländer*, 25:545; VA-*Busolt*, 25:1481), 'the use of the understanding' (VL-*Jäsche* 9:74, original emphasis) or the 'purposive use of [the faculty of cognition]' (KU 5:295).

However, the idea that Kant's anthropology of cognition has a pragmatic dimension is problematic. For whilst pragmatic anthropology is defined as 'the investigation of what he as a free-acting being makes of himself, or can and should make of himself' (A 7:119), cognising by contrast with acting, seems to be beyond the realm of voluntary action:

In most cases, such a procedure of giving our approval, or withdrawing it, or holding it back[,] does not rest at all on our free choice, but rather is necessitated through and by the laws of our understanding and our reason. (VL-*Blomberg* 24:156)

Whether we believe, what we believe and why we believe are not up to us since the idea of the will controlling beliefs makes no sense: 'The will does not have any influence immediately on holding-to-be-true; this would be quite absurd' (VL-*Jäsche* 9:74). If this is correct, it entails that we have no control over much of our cognition. Yet without some degree of control, the possibility of a pragmatic dimension of Kant's anthropology of cognition is in jeopardy: 'If we do not have [the powers of the mind] under the control

¹⁵ VA-*Friedländer* 25:499–502, 25:544–5; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1302–8; A 7:165–75, 7:202–21.

¹⁶ Respectively in VA-*Friedländer* 25:521–4, 25:499–502, 25:541–4, 25:515–21, 25:545–54, 25:514–5, 25:621–2; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1273–7, 25:1253–5, 25:1296–302, 25:1263–72, 25:1258–62, 25:1296–7; A 7:182–6, 7:149–51, 7:162–6, 7:197–202, 7:167–74, 7:228–9. For details on the improvement of the general cognitive faculty, see Schmidt (2004).

of the free power of choice, all provisions for such perfection are thus in vain' (VA-Friedländer 25:488). How can we hope to perfect our cognitive capacities or develop our cognitive talents if we have no control over our cognition, whether in terms of processes, operations, or faculties? The aim of this section is to show that Kant makes room for a form of control that is sufficient to account for the possibility of a pragmatic anthropology of cognition.

To begin with, Kant acknowledges that we do have control over the inquiries that give rise to our cognitive judgments: 'Holding-to-be-true pertains to the understanding, but investigation to the faculty of choice' (VL-Dohna-Wundlacken 24:736).¹⁷ It is up to us to determine whether to investigate a matter, how deep, for how long, what direction the inquiry takes, when we are satisfied with the results, and so on:

although approval does not depend *immediate* on men's choice, it nevertheless often does depend on it *indirecte, mediate*ly, since it is according to one's free wish that he seeks out those grounds that could in any way bring about approval for this or that cognition . . . it still requires closer direction of choice, will, wish, or in general of our free will, toward the grounds of proof. (VL-Blomberg 24:158, original emphasis)

Although beliefs differ from actions in some respects, acquiring beliefs entails the same processes as choosing how to act. They both require acts of the will, whether it is deliberating, weighing up options, or selecting the course of action that is best suited to our ends. As exemplified by scientific investigations, we can control the understanding, albeit indirectly, to the extent that our cognitive inquiries are led by the will: 'Insofar as the will either impels the understanding toward inquiry into a truth or holds it back therefrom, however, one must grant it an influence on the *use of the understanding*' (VL-Jäsche 9:74, original emphasis). Moreover, we have the capacity to control and withhold approval: 'In *suspensio judicii* there lies some freedom' (VL-Blomberg 24:736). Kant calls it a form of freedom because it is the capacity to resist the influence of inclinations on judgment, a capacity akin to the will's independence from the determination of desires.¹⁸ Inclinations hinder cognition just as they hinder morality, as suggested by the analogy between the cause of moral vice and that of false belief:

¹⁷ See also '*Judicia reflectentia* are those which introduce investigation, which show (1.) whether a matter needs investigation, (2.) how I ought to investigate a matter' (VL-Dohna-Wundlacken 24:737).

¹⁸ Kant sometimes calls our independence from the determination of desires the 'culture of discipline', which 'is negative and consists in the liberation of the will from the despotism of desires, a despotism that rivets us to certain natural things and renders us unable to do our own selecting' (KU 5:432).

Deviation from the rules of the pure will constitutes the morally evil, and this arises only when and because other effects of other powers mingle with the otherwise pure laws of the will. E.g.: The inclinations and affects. Just in this way, when foreign powers mingle with the correct laws of the understanding, a mixed effect arises, and error arises from the conflict of [this with] our judgments based on the laws of the understanding and of reason. (VL-*Blomberg* 24:102)

Insofar as they are ‘foreign powers’, inclinations are the cause of our errors.¹⁹ First, they interfere with the proper functioning of our cognitive faculties and thereby hinder the acquisition of knowledge.²⁰ Second, they preclude thorough epistemic investigations by giving us an unwarranted feeling of certainty and thereby corrupting our cognitive diligence.²¹ Finally, they prompt us to adopt beliefs on illegitimate grounds, for instance because they suit our taste or our wishes.²² The inclinations are thus an illness of the mind, at least as far as cognition is concerned. They produce illusions, unwarranted beliefs and false cognitions. They give rise to illegitimate epistemic procedures. They interfere with, misguide and distort the operations of our cognitive faculties in their pursuit of knowledge: ‘Through these [inclinations] we are transposed into a condition most unsuitable for judging’ (VL-*Vienna* 24:842). As a result, a cognitive agent who can control his inclinations is more efficient in the sense that he will be better armed to carry out his cognitive purposes: ‘Our perfection consists therein, that we are able to subjugate our faculties and capacities to the free power of choice’ (VA-*Friedländer* 25:485–6). This is why an essential part of Kant’s anthropology of cognition spells out how to facilitate, enhance and when necessary restore the will’s control over our cognitive powers:

We must therefore always take care to have our mental powers under our control, and this must already occur in early youth. We must thus not let sensibility dominate, but rather discipline it through the understanding, [so] that we can use it if and however it is conducive to our understanding. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1231–2)

¹⁹ ‘One of the most outstanding causes, however, that very frequently misleads man into making a false judgment, or even into an error, is the *affects*’ (VL-*Blomberg* 24:159–60, original emphasis).

²⁰ For instance, ‘Everything that stimulates and excites us serves to disadvantage our power of judgment’ (VL-*Blomberg* 24:60).

²¹ For instance, ‘In young minds this inclination to accept the seeming as true is so great that they find it very hard to withhold their judgment’ (VL-*Vienna* 24:860).

²² For instance, ‘*inclination* occasions us always to undertake examinations and investigations only from one side, and of course only from the side where we wish that it were so and not otherwise, and thus it occasions us to leave the other side, which might perhaps provide us with grounds for the opposite, completely uninvestigated’ (VL-*Blomberg* 24:167, original emphasis).

However, it is unclear that the capacity to resist the influence of inclinations is sufficient to account for the possibility of the pragmatic dimension of Kant's anthropology of cognition. For we need to distinguish between two types of control: the control of cognition from the outside (e.g. whether or not to inquire, what to inquire about, etc.) and the control of cognition from within (e.g. a priori laws, epistemic principles, etc.). Whilst the former is concerned with what motivates cognitive inquiries, the latter alone is strictly speaking cognitive. Yet both are necessary to secure the pragmatic dimension of Kant's account, for the idea of making our cognition more efficient is meaningless if we have no control over the functioning of our cognitive powers.

Yet although we lack direct control over cognition and its a priori laws, we have indirect control over it through our epistemic principles. This control occurs at the level of the maxims of judgment; that is to say, the rules that are necessary to direct thought in the pursuit of knowledge: 'the issue here is not the faculty of cognition, but the *way of thinking* needed to make a purposive use of it' (KU 5:295, original emphasis). Kant calls it the *sensus communis*, which consists in three 'maxims of common understanding' that spell out universal rules that guide knowledge acquisition in order to avoid 'error in general' (VL-*Jäsche* 9:57).²³ Whilst it is unnecessary to go into the details of these maxims here, what is crucial for my present purpose is that they are second-order epistemic principles whose role is to guide belief-acquisition and cognitive procedures more generally – what Kant calls 'the principles of thinking' (VA-*Busolt* 25:1480).²⁴ Crucially, all our cognitive improvement requires is the ability to choose our way of thinking, as spelt out by the maxim that commands free autonomous thought: 'The maxim of thinking for oneself can be called the *enlightened mode of thought*' – 'it is only using your own reason as the supreme touchstone of truth' (VL-*Jäsche* 9:57, original emphasis; VA-*Busolt* 25:1481). Thereby we are able to guide the operations of our cognitive powers, which is sufficient to secure the possibility of the pragmatic dimension of the anthropology of cognition. Whether we acquire beliefs according to principles at all, just as which principles we choose to adopt, is under our voluntary control. Of course,

²³ These maxims are: '1. Thinking for oneself. 2. Thinking in the place of another. 3. Always thinking in agreement with oneself' (VA-*Busolt* 25:1480). For other formulations of these maxims, see KU 5:294–5; and A 7:228. For a thorough discussion of the content of these maxims, see McBay Merritt (2011), section 2; Wood (2002), 103; and O'Neill (1989), Chapters 1–2.

²⁴ In fact, it is the aim of university education to instil students with the correct epistemic principles: 'instruction in universities is properly this, to cultivate the capacity of reason, and to get [students] into the habit of the method of ratiocinating, and to establish the appropriate maxims of reason' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:547).

if we fail to regulate, control or direct our cognitive practices according to the right epistemic principles, our mind stops being its own guide and it produces unwarranted judgments. By contrast, directing our cognitive powers according to rules spelt out by reason is the only means of getting closer to our cognitive perfection:

The greatest perfection of the powers of the mind is based on our subordinating them to our power of choice, and the more they are subjugated to the free power of choice, all the greater perfection of the powers of the mind do we possess. (VA-Friedländer 25:488)²⁵

4. Conclusion

This chapter set out to show that there is a crucial anthropological dimension to Kant's account of cognition that has been unacknowledged until now. It consists in the examination of our natural cognitive capacities with the pragmatic purpose of enabling us to become better, more efficient knowers in order to fulfil our cognitive vocation. Therefore, far from portraying human beings as disembodied pure minds, Kant's account of cognition takes into account their empirical, contingent and messy features. These features, I have argued, comprise the subjective dimension of cognition that results from our nature as embodied beings whose cognition takes place in the natural world.²⁶

The fundamental implication of my claim for our overall understanding of Kant's account of cognition is that it consists of three parts that are equally essential. First, it spells out the a priori forms of cognition that are valid for all *rational* cognizers (e.g. the fact that reason naturally enters a dialectic). Second, it investigates the a priori forms of cognition that are valid for rational *human* cognizers (e.g. the fact that we do not have an intuitive understanding or that we have a spatio-temporal form of intuition). And third, it examines the empirical conditions that are valid for *embodied* rational human cognizers (e.g. the fact that we have a particular temperament, personal history or set of relationships).²⁷ In this sense,

²⁵ See also 'the greatest perfection of man is that of being able to act according to his power of choice, to direct his cognition to an object and again turn away from it. This is also the first condition of all rules and precepts that I should uphold and practise; for if this is missing, I am also not able to direct myself according to rules' (VA-Mrongovius 25:1231).

²⁶ Contrast with 'in the veins of the knowing subject, such as . . . Kant [has] construed him, flows not real blood but rather the thinned fluid of reason as pure thought activity' (Dilthey (1922), viii).

²⁷ Note that the function of anthropology in Kant's account of cognition is analogous to that of moral anthropology in his ethics. For as I have argued elsewhere, Kant's ethics can be divided along the following lines. First, the project that produces an a priori system of duties for rational

Kant's familiar transcendental account, which expounds the a priori rules of cognition for human *cognizers*, is supplemented by a pragmatic part that expounds the empirical dimension of cognition for *human* cognizers. Whilst the former refers to our transcendental, objective cognitive condition (e.g. we have a discursive understanding, a spatio-temporal form of intuition, etc.), the latter refers to our empirical, subjective cognitive condition (e.g. we have emotions, temperaments, histories and cultures, sets of relationships, etc.).²⁸ By spelling out the conditions of possibility, function and content of Kant's anthropological account of cognition, I have tried to show that because of our cognitive nature as embodied human beings, we need not only a critique of pure reason, but also an anthropology of empirical reason: a pragmatic account of how we can, should and ought to cognize insofar as we are embodied human beings.

agents in general: by focusing on pure practical rationality alone, it is completely independent of any empirical knowledge of human nature (*Groundwork, Critique of Practical Reason*). Second, the project that generates an a priori system of the duties that are binding upon a particular type of agent, namely human agents: by presupposing certain empirical features of human nature and the human world more generally, it is not completely independent of our empirical knowledge of human nature (*Metaphysics of Morals*). And third, the project that examines the worldly helps and hindrances to human moral agency: it spells out the empirical helps and hindrances to moral agency (*Anthropology and Lectures on Anthropology*) – what Kant calls 'the subjective conditions in human nature' (MS 6:217). See Cohen (2009a), 89–90.

²⁸ As Arens has noted, whilst 'Kant's mind model from the *Critiques* was not intended to be pragmatic – it did not accommodate the variances arising from the contact of individual minds with unique historical environments', 'Kant's *Anthropology* added to this ahistorical model the additional dimension of affects, or personal habits of mind conditioned by personal and historical experience' (Arens (1990), 202–3).

CHAPTER 6

Affects and passions

Patrick R. Frierson

This chapter draws from Kant's *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* and *Lectures on Anthropology* to develop a Kantian account of the affects and passions in the light of Kant's empirical psychology. In particular, I focus on two key claims about affects and passions from Kant's published writings. First, in his *Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant claims that while affects are merely a "*lack of virtue*," passions are "*properly evil*" (MS 6:408, original emphasis). Second, in his *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, Kant distinguishes between affects and passions as follows:

Inclination that can be conquered only with difficulty or not at all by the subject's reason is *passion*. On the other hand, the feeling of a pleasure or displeasure in the subject's present state that does not let him to rise to *reflection* . . . is *affect*. (A 7:251, original emphasis)

This passage highlights a couple of important distinctions between affects and passions, most notably that passions are disordered *inclinations* while affects are disordered *feelings*. By providing a psychological account of affects and passions in terms of feeling and inclination, this chapter aims to make sense of Kant's moral assessment of each.

After the first section summarizing changes in Kant's treatments of affects and passions during the twenty years he lectured on the topic, I offer a brief account of Kant's empirical psychology in general. Sections 3 and 4 provide detailed accounts of the psychology of affects and passions (respectively) based on what I take to be his most developed statements about them, and section 5 applies this psychology to the moral assessment of each.

1. Kant's developing views on affects and passions in the anthropology lectures

Two key claims about affects and passions, present in the quotation from the *Anthropology* above, go back all the way to Kant's earliest anthropological

treatments of them: his general definition of affects and passions as states of feeling or desire that preclude reflection and his association of affects and passions respectively with the faculties of feeling and of desire/inclination. Both claims are already present in Kant's earliest lectures on anthropology. The Collins notes from Kant's first course in anthropology (1772–3) lay out his core definition of affects and passions: "A desire that is so big that it makes it impossible to compare the object of our desire with the sum of all inclination, is called affect" (VA-Collins 25:210; see too VA-Parow 25:411, from the same year). And Kant goes on to lay out his key distinction between them, appealing to "an English author," whom he later identifies as Hutcheson (see VA-Friedländer 25:589; VA-Menschenkunde 25:1115), as the source of the distinction:

An English author distinguished, and rightly so, the affects and the passions [*Leidenschaft, oder Passion*]. Passion is a desire, that makes us incapable of seeing the sum of all desires; affect is rather a feeling, which makes us incapable – of consulting the sum of all feelings. (VA-Collins 25:212–13; cf. VA-Parow 25:413)

Both claims persist throughout Kant's lecture courses in anthropology.¹ Despite this apparent uniformity, however, Kant's account of affects and passions changes from his early lectures through his published *Anthropology*.

The first and most striking change is an increasing consistency in distinguishing affects from passions. As the passages cited from Collins make clear, Kant's early lectures, while formally distinguishing affects from passions, fail to remain consistent on this distinction. Thus Kant's definition of affect at VA-Collins 25:210 (also VA-Parow 25:411) identifies *affects* not with *feelings* but with *desires*, precisely the way he later distinguishes *passions* from affects (see A 7:265; VA-Collins 25:212; VA-Mrongovius 25:1339). And this conflation of affect and passion is not a mere accident of these early lectures. In Parow (also 1772–3), Kant explicitly says, "In German, one calls affect passion" (VA-Parow 25:412). There, Kant treats *Affekt* as a Latin (*affectus*) or perhaps even English ("affect" or "affection") term, for which *Leidenschaft* (passion) is the appropriate German translation.² Throughout these early lectures, Kant uses "affect" and "passion" as synonyms, and gives examples (such as anger) that he calls both "affect" and "passion."

In these early lectures, then, Kant's introduction of the distinction between affects and passions has something of the importance that a similar

¹ See e.g. VA-Friedländer 25:589; VA-Menschenkunde 25:1115; VA-Mrongovius 25:1339; VA-Busolt 25:1526.

² Brandt (1999), in its note for A 7:251.17–19, points out that the German translation of Baumgarten's *Metaphysica* translates *affectus* in §679 as *Leidenschaft*.

distinction in his initial source – Francis Hutcheson – had. In his *Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections* (1742, translated into German in 1760), Hutcheson introduces his distinction between affects and passions with the phrase, “When the word *Passion* is imagined to denote anything different from the *Affections*” (Hutcheson (2002 [1742]), 28), a phrase that rightly highlights the casual nature of the distinction in Hutcheson himself. And Hutcheson’s actual distinction between the concepts – that passion

includes, beside the *Desire* or *Aversion* . . . a *confused Sensation* either of Pleasure or Pain, occasioned or attended by some violent bodily Motions, which keeps the Mind much employed upon the present Affair . . . and prolongs or strengthens the Affection sometimes to such a degree, as to prevent all *deliberate Reasoning* about our Conduct (ibid., original emphasis)

– is almost the reverse of Kant’s own. Hutcheson does make an important distinction between desire and mere sensation that is akin to Kant’s distinction between desire and feeling, but Hutcheson’s whole account of affections and passions treats them – as Kant does in these early lectures – as synonymous. And Hutcheson sees neither affections nor passions as precluding reflection in the way that Kant does. Kant seems to have combined his reading of Hutcheson on affects and passions with his own emerging faculty psychology to develop a distinction that he ascribes in these early lectures to Hutcheson, but that is truly his own. In these early lectures, however, Kant follows Hutcheson in being casual about the distinction, making it but then virtually ignoring it throughout his discussion.

Over time, however, the faculty-based distinction between affect and passion becomes more prominent. In the *Friedländer Lectures* (1775–6), Kant continues to conflate affects and passions in certain respects, describing “anger,” for instance, in some places as a passion (VA-*Friedländer* 25:612) and in others as an affect (VA-*Friedländer* 25:599). But Kant develops the distinction in terms of feeling and desire in much greater detail in these lectures. He follows up his introduction of this distinction with an explanation of its implications, noting in particular that passions are oriented towards “what is possible and future” and affects towards “the present,” and Kant uses this distinction to differentiate particular emotions: “Thus fright is a state of feeling . . . therefore it pertains to affect. Longing, however, is a passion. Sadness is an affect. Obsessive ambition is a passion” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:589). And his overall treatment is distinguished into discussions of affects and then of passions, without the general conflation of terms in the previous lectures. In *Pillau* (1777–8), we find very clear statements of the distinct definitions of affect and passion, the former as an incapacity

“to compare a feeling with the sum of all feelings” and the latter as the state “when we lose the capacity to compare an inclination with the sum of all inclinations” (VA-Pillau 25:801). Kant experiments with developing a conceptual distinction between “at peace” (*ruhig*) and “content” (*zufrieden*) to distinguish states of being without affect and without passion. And Kant generally distinguishes between examples of each emotional state, though again treats anger as both affect and passion (VA-Pillau 25:802). In later lectures, the distinction sharpens, culminating in the clear contrast of *Mrongovius* (25:1339–40), *Busolt* (25:1526) and the published *Anthropology* (A 7:251). The *Busolt* lectures, delivered in 1788–9, go so far as to claim that “where there is much affect, there is little passion, and vice versa” (VA-*Busolt* 25:1526), a far cry from the claim sixteen years earlier that *Leidenschaft* (“passion”) is merely the German term for affect (*Affekt*) (VA-*Parow* 25:412).

Along with the increased emphasis on his faculty-based distinction between affects and passions, Kant also develops further distinctions between the two. Two of the most important developments relate to the different temporality of affects and passions.³ Affects are seen as rooted in the present and of short duration; while passions are oriented towards the future and of long duration. In the earliest lectures, both affects and passions are conceived of as being temporary, even fleeting. Thus the *Friedländer* notes claim, “Both affects [and] passions are an agitation of the mind and not a continual state” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:589). But even within the *Friedländer* notes Kant says, “Some passions are transitory, others persisting,” and then, for examples, mentions that “anger is transitory; hatred, in contrast with it, persists” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:612).⁴ In later lectures (and the published *Anthropology*), the distinction between the transitory and non-transitory will be identified with the distinction between affects and passions.⁵ As the distinction between affects and passions crystalizes, Kant ascribes a different temporality to each: “With desires is not the perception of the actual and present, but rather a presentiment of the future. Feeling relates to the present. True affects belong to feeling, and passions to desire” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1115). But Kant comes to refine this view of

³ Another important difference relates to Kant’s accounts of the natural teleology of affects and passions. In earlier lectures, both passions and affects are seen as provided for by Nature (see e.g. VA-*Friedländer* 25:617), but in later lectures, Kant emphasizes the distinction between affects, which are provided by Nature until reason can take over (see VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1120, 1123–4; A 7:253) and passions, which are products of social life that are in no cases and in no respect good, but are an unnatural and bad effect of otherwise purposive elements of human nature (our inclinations, our unsocial sociability, and our developing rational capacities).

⁴ Kant even connects this transitoriness of certain emotions with a decreased blameworthiness: “The transitory passions, if they are evil, are sooner pardonable, than the [ones that] persist and have taken root, for these commit bad actions in accordance with rules” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:612).

⁵ See VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1122; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1340; VA-*Busolt* 25:1520, 1526; A 7:252–3, 265–6.

each's temporality. For affects in particular, Kant points out that they have an intrinsically future orientation: "Affect can be [rooted in the] present; but its prospect is the future" (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1343). The difference between affect and passion comes to be tied to the way in which each is oriented towards the future, affect by means of a present sensation that either acts or fades away, passion by means of a fixed interest in future goals.

As these distinctions become sharper, Kant is able to sort different emotional states more clearly into categories. Thus while the earlier lectures see hatred, anger, being in love, avarice, and fear as just several different affects/passions, later lectures come to distinguish sharply between emotions that are properly affects – such as anger, fear, sadness, and pity (see e.g. VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1343–4, 1347) – and those that are properly passions (see VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1356–60). With respect to passions in particular, Kant develops an elaborate taxonomy, within which the passions for vainglory, domination, and greed (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1356) play particularly prominent roles, along with the sexual/amorous passion (see VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1359).

Kant's lectures on anthropology begin with a general treatment of affects and passions as an undistinguished set of emotions that compromise self-governance by precluding the sort of reflection needed to compare particular feelings/inclination with the sum total of all feelings/inclination. By the time of his published *Anthropology*, Kant maintains this general account but has developed a clear psychological and philosophical distinction between affects – short-term and immediate feelings that overwhelm one – and passions – long-lasting inclinations, consistent with some level of reflection, that dominate one's faculty of desire. In the rest of this chapter, drawing from throughout Kant's lectures where appropriate, I integrate Kant's more developed distinction between affects and passions with his general empirical-psychological account of human action, in order to show how affects and passions work, and why they are ascribed such different moral importance.

2. Kant's empirical psychology in brief

Before turning to the psychology of affects and passions, this section offers some general overview of Kant's empirical psychology.⁶ The central

⁶ Like Kant's particular treatments of affects and passions, his empirical psychology underwent modifications over the course of the time when he was lecturing in anthropology, but this section offers only a brief overview of Kant's eventual empirical psychology.

conceptual framework for Kant's empirical psychology is provided by his distinction between three central human "faculties": cognition, feeling, and desire.⁷ Cognition is a faculty of apprehending objects, whether through the senses, imagination, or reason. Feeling is a subjective faculty whereby one experiences pleasure or pain. And desire is the faculty whereby representations of ends bring about actions directed towards those ends. Given this distinction between kinds of mental state (cognitive, affective, and volitional), Kant explains human actions via interactions between them:

Pleasure precedes the faculty of desire, and the cognitive faculty precedes pleasure . . . [W]e can desire or abhor nothing which is not based on pleasure or displeasure . . . Thus pleasure or displeasure precedes desire or abhorrence. But still I must first cognize what I desire, likewise what gives me pleasure or displeasure; accordingly, both are based on the cognitive faculty. (VM-*Mrongovius* 29:877–8)

Human action is caused by desire, which is caused by pleasure, which is caused by cognition.⁸

Kant further distinguishes higher from lower faculties. Higher faculties of cognition are the rational powers (judgment, the understanding, and reason), while lower faculties are the senses and imagination. Higher feelings are those caused by higher cognitive faculties, such as the feelings of pleasure in maxims to which one is committed. Lower feelings are caused by sensible or imagined awareness, such as the feeling of pleasure in tasting a mango. Desires are higher or lower depending upon the state of the feelings that cause them (i.e. higher feelings cause higher desires). And, for Kant, one explains connections between cognitions and consequent feelings and desires in terms of underlying grounds, such as instincts, inclinations, or – for higher desires – "character."

For the lower faculty of desire, the relevant "cognitions" are sensory, and desires follow from those sensations by instinct or habitual inclination, unmediated by reflection. In contrast, the higher faculty of desire always involves cognition of a practical principle for action and a character that takes up that principle. Even if the cognition of this principle is caused by sensations (direct or imagined), the pleasure and consequent volition are caused by the cognition of the principle rather than directly by those sensations. Thus when one *decides* to "have a smoke," while there may have been an immediate craving that arose from the awareness of certain sensory

⁷ For more detail on Kant's empirical psychology, see Frierson (2005); Frierson (2013); and Frierson (2014).

⁸ See VA-Friedländer 25:577; VA-Busolt 25:1514; VM-Vigilantius 29:1012, 1024.

stimuli combined with an “inclination” to respond to those stimuli with a desire, one’s decision to smoke is based not directly on this craving but upon the taking up of this craving into a practical principle – a maxim – for action: “I’ll have a quick smoke to satisfy my craving.” One who simply finds herself smoking another cigarette without having ever “decided” to do so is motivated by the lower faculty of desire (*mere* inclination).

One important implication of this distinction between the lower and higher faculties of desire relates to the way that feelings prompt each sort of desire. Lower desires are prompted by actually present sensations, so a feeling that prompts direct action-from-inclination is responsive to presently given situations. One takes out a cigarette purely from inclination only in response to a present feeling of pain or discomfort (or a present pleasure at the sight of someone else smoking). But higher desires are responsive to maxims. One who acts on the *maxim* to have a quick smoke can (at least in principle) cognize the principle without the immediate presence of the craving, can plan for future smokes in the light of a principle that covers the future as well as the present. Of course, such a smoker will likely need a present pleasure in the fulfillment of the maxim in order for that maxim to motivate, and, for this particular case, will need to anticipate future pleasures in the satisfaction of future cravings. But the present pleasure is caused by and directed towards a principle that covers more than merely the present. One who smokes *merely* from inclination will, if the present stimulus somehow passes, no longer have any motivation for taking out any cigarettes. A person who smokes from principle can continue to be motivated to act in the light of a principled concern for possible cravings, even while not currently experiencing any cravings.

3. The psychology of affects

Kant describes both affects and passions as “*illness[es] of mind*” (A 7:251) or “emotional agitations” (*Gemüthsbewegungen*) (VA-Friedländer 25:589; VA-Menschenkunde 25:1115) and classifies them in terms of the faculty of soul that each affects, with affects being disorders of the faculty of feeling while passions are disorders in the faculty of desire/volition (e.g. VA-Friedländer 25:589). The disorder common to both is explained by Kant as that through which we “come out of composure”; more specifically, “both affect and passion shut out the sovereignty of reason” (A 7:251). Based on these descriptions, affects and passions would both preclude rational self-governance, and the difference between them would relate to whether

they do this by means of feeling or desire/inclination. In both cases, it is important to distinguish affects and passions from “emotions” and from ordinary feelings, desires, and inclinations. For Kant, even very strong feelings and inclinations need not be affects or passions; they rise to the level of these illnesses of mind only when they preclude reflection or “can be conquered with difficulty or not at all by the subject’s reason” (A 7:251; cf. e.g. *VA-Menschenkunde* 25:1115–18).

But this apparently straightforward account of affects and passions is not sufficient, for two main reasons. First, it leaves unsolved the question why Kant would make such a sharp moral distinction between the two illnesses of mind, calling one “properly evil” and the other a mere “lack of virtue” (MS 6:408). But second, and of more immediate importance, it is not clear precisely *how* affects and passions shut out the sovereignty of reason. And in particular, it is unclear how any illness of mind that is relevant to human actions – as both affects and passions are – could avoid involving *both* feeling *and* desire/volition. Given Kant’s general account of human action, it looks like affects will need to give rise to desires if they are to cause action, and passions will need to involve feelings (and, very likely, disordered ones) if they are to arise at all. But Kant makes clear that while affects and passions “are equally vehement in degree,” “as concerns their quality they are essentially different from each other” (A 7:251; cf. *VA-Menschenkunde* 25:1115). Thus more needs to be said about what precisely is going on in the case of motivation by affects and passions and how this is different from other cases of human motivation. As we will see, getting clearer on how each motivates will also help explain why there is an important moral difference between the two.

We start, in this section, with affects. Kant emphasizes, “it is not the intensity of a certain feeling that constitutes the affected state, but the lack of reflection” (A 7:254). The “reflection” that affects preclude is “the representation by means of reason as to whether he should give himself up to [the feeling] or refuse it” (A 7:251), and in particular a failure to compare “this feeling with the sum of all feelings (of pleasure or displeasure)” (A 7:254; cf. *VA-Menschenkunde* 25:1118; *VA-Mrongoivius* 25:1340). Affects are “thoughtless” and involve a sudden “surprise through sensation” that “suspend[s] the mind’s composure,” “mak[ing] reflection impossible” (A 7:252). They arise and dissipate quickly, before one even has time to reflect. Kant compares affects to the “bursting of a dam,” a flash flood (*VA-Menschenkunde* 25:1121–2), a “drunkenness that one sleeps off” (A 7:252), “a fit of madness,” a “strong but temporary whirlwind” (*VA-Menschenkunde*

25:1118) and even a “paroxysm” (A 7:253). Kant also seems to connect affects particularly closely with bodily states, dividing them into those that “*excite* the vital force” and those that “*relax* the vital force” (A 7:255, original emphasis), describing fright as “dependent for the most part merely on bodily causes” (A 7:256), emphasizing physiological features of affects like anger and shame (e.g. at A 7:260), and even devoting a section to “Affects by which Nature Promotes Health Mechanically” (A 7:261).⁹

Given their particular connection to feeling, affects might seem to have no particular *motivational* import at all. And sometimes when Kant discusses affects, he focuses on them merely as feelings, without regard for motivational efficacy. Thus Kant illustrates the absence of reflection with a rich man who sees a goblet broken and “gives himself over completely to this one feeling of pain (without quickly making that calculation [of the importance of the goblet relative to other goods] in thought)” and thereby “feels as if his entire happiness were lost” (A 7:254; cf. VA-Pillau 25:801; VA-Busolt 25:1116). Similarly, “fright” seems to be an affect that merely “disconcerts the mind” without implications for desire or action (A 7:255; cf. VA-Friedländer 25:589). These problems are described purely at the level of irrationally ordered feelings, without necessary reference to motivational effects.

But, for Kant, affects are not generally motivationally vacuous. Within Kant’s empirical psychology, feelings generally cause desires. And Kant emphasizes that while “there are affects, that directly hit only at sensibility, [there are] others that, besides the senses, also penetrate the soul [that is, the faculty of desire]” (VA-Menschenkunde 25:1125). Typically, those with affect “*act* irrationally” (VA-Mrongovius 25:1340, emphasis added) and affect can “double all [one’s] powers” and serve “as a spur to activity” (VA-Mrongovius 25:1343). Thus “*Anger* . . . quickly stirs up powers to resist ill” (A 7:255, original emphasis), and “affects” can be “violent,” as when someone “is so angry that she has turned the whole house upside down” (VA-Friedländer 25:620–1). The effectiveness of affects at generating activity even leads Kant to say that “the human being manifests greater strength in [a state of] affect . . . than if he is cool-headed” (VA-Friedländer 25:615) so that “some people even wish that they could get angry, and Socrates was doubtful as to whether it would not be good to get angry at times” (A 7:253). More crudely, “the affect of fright [can] produce a scream” (VA-Friedländer 25:600), and even affects that primarily paralyze rather than stimulate (such as shock and certain cases of fear or anger; cf. VA-Friedländer 25:591–2) have direct

⁹ Borges (2008) emphasizes this physical–biological component of affects.

effects – even if only negative – on action. Given that Kant sees most feelings as practical, he quite reasonably moves from discussions of the disorder of *feeling* involved in affect to the ways in which this disorder affects desires and thereby action.

The way affects can be disorders of feeling and relevant to action can be understood by analogy with “temperaments of feeling,” which directly influence feeling but give rise to characteristic actions, as when the sanguine person “attributes a great importance to each thing for the moment, and the next moment may not give it another thought” (A 7:287–8) and as a result “makes promises in all honesty, but does not keep his word” (A 7:288). Because feelings are typically motivational, the character of one’s faculty of feeling affects one’s actions. In the case of affects, sufficiently strong feelings involve a “suspension of composure” (A 7:252; cf. VA-Friedländer 25:589–90, 611), where to “keep one’s composure means . . . the mind is subject to our power of choice” (VA-Friedländer 25:589). The way affects preclude reflection is to compromise the influence of the power of choice; that is, the higher faculty of desire. For affects with volitional importance (whether through provoking actions or paralyzing one’s capacity for action), affects prompt “actions” through bypassing choice: “in affect, the person cannot carry out a rational choice” (VA-Collins 25:212). In terms of Kant’s psychology, one’s actions are motivated solely according to the lower faculties of sensation, feeling, and desire.

As feelings so overwhelming that one that one cannot properly assess their place in one’s overall happiness, affects become *immediate* causes of action, bypassing consultation with higher faculties of cognition and desire. Thus in *Anthropology* (and throughout his lectures), Kant emphasizes that affect relates to “the subject’s present state” (A 7:251; but cf. VA-Menschenkunde 25:1125; VA-Mrongovius 25:1343). Consistent with this emphasis on the lower faculties, Kant points out that affects move through merely animal rather than distinctively human forms of volition.¹⁰ Affects are tied to a “propensity to sink back into animality” (VA-Menschenkunde 25:1125):

Instinct drives only savage people, as long as they are still half animal . . . This affect springs out of a natural instinct and rules us for a while until we are ruled by reason . . . Then the instinct must cease. (VA-Menschenkunde 25:1114)

¹⁰ Accordingly, in his *Friedländer* lectures, where the distinction was not yet as sharp as in later lectures, Kant associates both affects and passions with animality (see VA-Friedländer 25:616–17). Later (e.g. VA-Mrongovius 25:1360–1) Kant emphasizes that passions, unlike animal instincts, depend upon socialization and culture and hence are distinctively human.

Nature [gave] the predisposition to [affects] to our animality... If the human being has emerged from animality, he does not need the affects anymore and must suppress them. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1342–3)

Affects are disorders of feeling that so displace humans' abilities to reflect and reason that we sink to the level of animals, either paralyzed with strong feelings or motivated in merely animal ways, without choice or conscious deliberation.

One important challenge to this account is what we might call the "challenge from Kantian freedom."¹¹ Kant is widely taken to hold a view of human agency according to which human beings are incapable of being compelled by sensuous incentives unless those are freely endorsed. The most common version of this point is framed in terms of the "incorporation thesis," which takes Kant's claim that "freedom of the power of choice has this characteristic, entirely peculiar to it, that it cannot be determined to action through any incentive *except so far as the human being has incorporated it into his maxim*" (R 6:23–4, original emphasis) as a general principle of human action. Maria Borges,¹² for example, claims, "As strong as emotions [which in the context particularly includes affects] can be, and as much of a problem for morality as they can portray, the very idea of practical reason presupposes that agents can decide how to act" (Borges (2004), 157). Such a conception of human agency would preclude an account of affects as altogether *bypassing* choice based on maxims (the motives of the higher faculty of desire).

In fact, however, this challenge from Kantian freedom does not pose real problems for Kant's account of affects. Most of the passages in which Kant seems to preclude actions caused independently of maxims or choice in fact make a narrower point. The classic formulation of the incorporation thesis, for example, is specifically described as an account of how *the power of choice* is determined to action.¹³ But the power of choice is precisely a

¹¹ There are other challenges as well. One, which I call the "challenge of rational affects," arises from the fact that some affects (notably but not exclusively enthusiasm) seem caused by ideas of reason and hence grounded in higher faculties (cf. Sorenson (2002); Clewis (2009)). Another problem, dealt with in part in the next section, is that my account here implies that affects have their ground in inclinations, in apparent contrast to Kant's explicit identification of inclination with passion. I discuss both in more detail in Frierson (2014).

¹² Borges is a particularly relevant example here because she is generally very resistant to overemphasizing the role of freedom in governing emotions, specifically targeting the view of emotions laid out by Marcia Baron in Baron (1995).

¹³ Allison, consistent with the claims I make here and throughout this section, is careful to describe the incorporation thesis as a thesis about "rational agency" (e.g. Allison (1990), 5, 40), not about human actions altogether.

power of the *higher* faculty of volition. Insofar as affects bypass this faculty, they also bypass any need to be incorporated into maxims. One might read this passage as a general claim about all action, but the passage itself is narrower in scope. Similarly, Borges's key text in defense of her application of the incorporation thesis to human action in general is taken from Kant's lectures on ethics:

Can I really conceive of a pathological compulsion in man as well? Truly I cannot, for freedom consists in this, that he can be without compulsion in the pathological sense; nor should he be compelled in that way. Even if a man is so constrained, he can nevertheless act otherwise. (VMO-*Mrongovius* 29:617)

But this passage, too, has a narrower application. Kant makes this claim in the context of an example of "fear of punishment" as a "compulsion [that] is pathological" (VMO-*Mrongovius* 29:617), and Kant's point is that in ordinary cases, impulses do not literally "compel" one to act but merely provide a strong but resistible incentive. That does not imply that there cannot be cases in which human beings act directly on feelings of certain sorts – affects – without the reflection required to be "capable of doing otherwise" in any meaningful sense.

In this respect, Kant's classic example of affect – anger – can be misleading. Sometimes feelings of anger literally overpower one, bypassing reflection, but at other times feelings of anger merely exert a particularly strong influence on deliberation. Flinging something at someone in a rage is quite unlike deciding to hurt someone because one is angry at them. That affects apply to the former example rather than to the latter is particularly evident in the context of what Kant calls "wild affects," where the "affect . . . negates its own natural effect" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:591):

For example, one sees a child fall into the water, who one could save, however, through a small aid, but one is so shocked that one thereby cannot do anything. Shock anaesthetizes someone such that one is thereby unable to do anything at all. Similarly, one can be completely shocked by joy over an unexpected good fortune, and indeed also in this way, that one is completely limp; whereas joy should surely, on the contrary, have good consequences, but since the affect is wild, it itself negates its effect. It is just the same with the affect of anger. Anger should, after all, have the effect of taking someone to task and reproaching him, yet often the angry person is . . . is irritated, quivers and trembles, and cannot say a word; that is an unrestrained affect. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:591–2)¹⁴

¹⁴ See too A 7:260 f.; VA-*Collins* 25:211; VA-*Parow* 25:412; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1116.

In all three cases, the relevant affect is a strong feeling that prevents reflection, and in each case it is clear that the way in which it prevents reflection is not by misleading deliberation but by forestalling it altogether. These are, as Kant indicates, special cases. But they are special not in the way that they forestall reflection but in the effects of that forestalling. The affect of anger that provokes one to do immediate harm to its object precludes reflection just as much as the paralyzing “unrestrained” or “wild” affect. The difference is that the flinging anger accomplishes its natural effect, while the quivering anger works against that effect.

Given this account of affect, it should be clear that Borges and other interpreters are wrong to think that, for Kant, emotions are always capable of being overridden by practical reason. But it should also be clear that *this* sort of emotional lack of control is not a fundamental problem for Kant’s overall account of human agency. We might say of affects what Edward Hinchman has said of cases where one “is gripped by an arational force”: “There is nothing philosophically perplexing . . . about compulsive action . . . The mental activity or behavior in question simply does not qualify as choice, intention, or action” (Hinchman (2009), 407–8). More precisely, human “actions” motivated by affects are not the actions of humans qua rational agents. While they may still be “intentional” in the sense that there can be a representation of an end that brings about movement towards that end – as in the case of furious rage – they are not “intentional” in the *rational* sense; that is, no end has been incorporated into a maxim that provides a motive for the higher faculty of desire. Thus there is no “choice” in these cases, in either the contemporary or the Kantian sense. This solution, of course, leaves unsettled important issues about the extent to which human beings can be held responsible for affect-driven actions, but I reserve discussion of those issues for section 5.

4. The psychology of passions

Turning from affects to passions, Kant’s account might look superficially similar. Like affects, passions are “illnesses of mind” that “shut out the sovereignty of reason” (A 7:251), and just as affects prevent the comparison of one feeling with others, a passion is an “[i]nclination that prevents reason from comparing it with the sum of all inclinations in respect to a certain choice” (A 7:265).¹⁵ But unlike affects, “the calm with which one gives oneself up to [a passion] permits reflection and allows the mind to form

¹⁵ Cf. VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1141; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1339–40, 1353; VA-*Busolt* 25:1519.

principles" (MS 6:408, cf. A 7:266). Thus while passions "can be conquered only with difficulty or not at all by the subject's reason" (A 7:251), they nonetheless seem to involve reflection to a considerably greater degree than do affects.

To figure out to what extent passions can involve reflection, it is important to clarify in what sense passions are "inclinations." Kant uses the term "inclination" in two crucially different senses throughout his empirical psychology (and moral philosophy). On the one hand, an inclination in the strict sense is a ground of the lower faculty of desire, whereby certain sensations are connected with volition. In this context, "inclinations" are distinct from instincts in being acquired, and distinct from character in that they relate to the lower rather than higher faculties of feeling and desire. But on the other hand, Kant often uses the term "inclination" to refer indirectly to practical principles that determine one's higher faculty of desire to pursue ends set by inclinations in the strict sense. Here an "inclination" can refer to any particular practical principle that has sensuously given ends, whether these are given by instinct or by inclination, and it contrasts with *pure* practical principles (the moral law). One who incorporates the end of an inclination in the strict sense into a maxim for action has an "inclination" in this second, derived sense. In the context of passions, one must discern which sort of inclination a passion is.

When Kant identifies passion as an inclination, he primarily has in mind the second sense, which allows passions to involve commitments to principles that make objects of inclinations their ends: "the calm with which one gives oneself up to [a passion] permits reflection and allows the mind to form principles" (MS 6:408). More specifically, "Passion always presupposes a maxim on the part of the subject [and] is therefore always connected with his reason" (A 7:266, see too A 7:410).

Kant's descriptions of the passionate man even make him sound like a paradigmatic case of true character, since he is consistent and even principled in pursuing his passion. The "cold passions," which Kant identifies with "*manias for honor, dominance, and possession*" are not only "not connected with the impetuosity of an affect" but *are* connected with "the persistence of a maxim established for certain ends" (A 7:268, original emphasis).

Kant must, then, be distinguishing between two different senses of "reflection" and "principles" here, where passions preclude one sort but allow another. Elsewhere, Kant makes clearer what he has in mind. As in the case of affects, passions involve a lack of *comparison*: "Inclination that prevents reason from comparing it with the sum of all inclinations

in respect to a certain choice is *passion*” (A 7:265). In particular, passion makes a person “blind to . . . purposes which his [other] inclinations also offer him[, which] he ignores completely” (A 7:266). But unlike affects, “passions can be paired with the calmest reflection” and thus “are not thoughtless; rather, they take root and can even coexist with rationalizing” (A 7:265).

Iain Morriison has helpfully characterized a distinction between maxims of different sorts that can helpfully be applied to the case of passions:¹⁶ Some “maxims actually justify actions twice over. They justify actions both in terms of the immediate end contained in the maxim and in terms of the end of happiness” (Morriison (2005), 82). Other maxims, however, justify actions only in one sense; that is, merely in terms of proposing good means to achieve the end contained in the maxim (an end for which one has an inclination). Passions would allow the second sort of maxim – one justified in terms of the immediate end of inclination – but preclude the first – one also justified in terms of overall happiness, or, more generally, a consideration of all of one’s ends (pragmatic and moral).

Thus, to take one of Kant’s favorite examples of a passion – passionate vengeance (see A 7:270) – the maxim “revenge is a dish best served cold” (i.e. “retaliate for wrongdoing only after waiting”) might be well justified in terms of the inclination (passion) for revenge, but might *not* be justified in terms of one’s overall long-term happiness. One with a passion for vengeance would be motivated by this principle, structuring decisions, formulating subordinating maxims, and so on, all in accordance with the desire for revenge. By contrast, one with a pure inclination, *in the strict sense*, for revenge would not even formulate maxims but would simply strike out in retaliation. While this might be possible, Kant would classify it under the affect of anger rather than the passion of vengeance with its lasting maxims. And for yet another contrast, for one with an *inclination* to revenge incorporated through reflection into an overall principle of self-love in the pursuit of happiness (with or without a moral proviso), maxims of revenge would be considered not only in terms of the benefits of satisfying the inclination for vengeance, but also in terms of its effects on one’s long-term well-being. One *might*, in that context, end up endorsing the maxim of patient and fierce retaliation, but one might just as easily – or even more easily – endorse something like the Hobbesian maxim to “in revenges . . . look not at the greatness of the evil past, but the greatness of

¹⁶ Morriison does in fact apply this to the case of passions at the end of his article (see Morriison (2005), 85–7). I largely agree with Morriison’s account, but I think that it conflates passions and weakness of will with insufficient attention to the variety of ways human willing can go astray.

the good to follow. Whereby we are forbidden to inflict punishment with any other design than for correction of the offender, or direction of others” (Hobbes (1660), Chapter 15).

We can make two further refinements to this account of passions. First, while Kant often focuses on the way in which passions preclude reflection *on other inclinations*, passions that prevent reflecting on other inclinations or on happiness as a whole also prevent reflection on requirements of duty (cf. VMo-Collins 27:368; MS 6:408–9). Second, passions preclude reflection not by *bypassing* higher faculties, nor merely by outweighing other relevant concerns. The passionate person rationally deliberates, but only in terms of his guiding passion, so nothing unconnected with that passion gets a hearing. But this passion is one upon which the passionate person has settled *intentionally*, and the maxims for the satisfaction of this passion have become abiding principles of the person’s character. One with passion has a principled commitment to pursue the ends of passion, without regard to any other ends.

5. The moral status of affects and passions

The model developed in the previous sections lays out two ways human beings act against their own best interests (whether those be moral or prudential). Affects are disordered feelings that bypass the higher faculties altogether, while passions are disorders *of* the higher faculty whereby it focuses its practical principles around a particular end but does not reflect on the value of that end relative to others. Thus an angry rage wherein one lashes out would be an affect. A hateful vengeance whereby one organizes life-principles around the desire to do harm to another, and does so without considering the moral or prudential cost of these principles, would be a passion. This model makes sense of many of the characteristics that distinguish affects from passions, such as the tendency of affects to arise and pass away quickly and of passions to persist and fester (e.g. A 7:252), but among the most important advantages of this model is that it provides a psychological background from which to understand Kant’s assessment of the moral status of affects and passions. In particular, this model helps make clear why Kant would insist, as he does in the *Metaphysics of Morals*, that affects are merely a “lack of virtue” while passions are “properly evil” (MS 6:408).

For explaining this moral assessment, it is important to clarify precisely in what Kant considers moral evil to consist. When Kant turns to evil in *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*, he explains,

The difference, whether a human being is good or evil, must not lie in the difference between the incentives that he incorporates into his maxims (not in the material of the maxims) but in their *subordination* (in the form of the maxim): *which of the two he makes the condition of the other*. (R 6:36, original emphasis)

The “incentives” of which Kant speaks here include the moral law and various sensuous incentives, which latter are incorporated into particular maxims by means of a general principle of self-love. Without going into all of the details of his account,¹⁷ Kant’s general point is that to be morally good is to be such that one’s maxims of choice are structured in such a way that the moral law is prioritized over all other practical ends. Moreover, the relevant subordination here must involve *consistent* prioritization of the moral law: “The statement, ‘The human being is *evil*,’ cannot mean anything else than that he is conscious of the moral law and yet has incorporated into his maxim the (occasional) deviation from it” (R 6:32, original emphasis). One can be evil while still subordinating *some* non-moral ends to the moral law, unless one’s character *always* prioritizes the moral law.

In this context, the evil of passions should be clear. A passion is a deliberate orientation of the higher faculty of desire towards promoting the end of a particular inclination. An agent influenced by a passion has a determinate character constituted by consistent maxims in pursuit of a particular good. Because these are maxims of the higher faculty, this constitution of character is ascribable to a free intelligible character.¹⁸ And these maxims are endorsed independently of any consideration of their moral or prudential costs. But human evil is identical to the subordination of the moral law to non-moral incentives, so one with a passion is evil. Nonetheless, passions are a special case of human evil. Generally, evil is understood in terms of the subordination of the moral law to principles of self-love or one’s own happiness. In the present case, even self-love is subordinated to a particular inclination. But the general characteristic of human evil – the prioritization of non-moral to moral incentives – is wholly operative. And since passions work *through* the higher faculty rather than *around* it, one can be held fully responsible for one’s passions. One characterized by maxims that prioritize the ends of a particular inclination to all others – including moral ones – is properly evil.

¹⁷ For more, see Frierson (2003), 108–14; and Frierson (2013), 72–81.

¹⁸ For a defense of the connection between the empirically evident higher faculties and the ascription of deeds to a free intelligible character, see Frierson (2008).

Prima facie, the moral status of affects is equally clear. As operations of the lower faculty of desire, affects bypass humans' power of choice. Thus what one does under the influence of affect is not "action" in the strict sense, and one cannot be held directly accountable for it. Even before Kant had clearly distinguished affects from passions, when he still allowed for both passions and affects to be "[s]ome . . . transitory, others persisting," he has already foreshadowed his insight that the "transitory passions, if they are evil, are sooner pardonable, than the [ones that] persist and have taken root, for these commit bad actions in accordance with rules" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:612). Over time, persistence would be more strongly linked with the rule-governedness of the higher faculty of desire and made a central feature of *passions*, and the transitory and merely animal-like motivational force of the affects would become not only "less blameworthy" but wholly without evil in the true sense. For that reason, affects are a mere "*lack of virtue*" and, as it were, something childish and weak, which can indeed coexist with the best will" (MS 6:408, original emphasis). Because they bypass the higher faculties altogether, we might say that affects are an *absence* of free agency rather than a misuse of it. What one does under the influence of an affect cannot be ascribed to one's intelligible character and thus cannot strictly be imputed. Put another way, there is no "practical perspective" on actions from affect. One finds oneself to have done (or to be doing) something, which one promptly regrets and rejects, but under the influence of affect, one does not "act" in any sense that implicates a posture of freedom.

However, Kant's account of the moral status of affects is more complex. First, Kant insists that affects, like passions, must be resisted by a moral apathy. In his *Metaphysics of Morals*, affects are introduced along with passions as something that needs to be "subdue[ed]" in order to "be . . . one's own master in a given case" and thereby have the "inner freedom" required for virtue (MS 6:407). And in corresponding lectures, Kant emphasizes, "Anger, to be sure, is also contrary to the duty of apathy, whereby we must not abandon ourselves to any affect" (VMo-*Vigilantius* 27:687). Kant even says, "we blame ourselves, when we let ourselves come into affect" (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1118; cf. VA-*Busolt* 25:1527). Relatedly, Kant often treats affects as feelings over the origin of which one has a certain degree of control. He describes one who "*lets . . . lively sympathy . . . rise into an affect*" (MS 6:408–9, emphasis added), and his account of the man who obsesses over the shattering of a "beautiful and rare crystal goblet" describes him as one who "*gives himself over completely* to this one feeling of pain" (A 7:254, emphasis added). Both cases involve a reference to something like a free act, and thus some sort of responsibility for the emergence of

the affect. Combined with the obligation to develop an apathy that could prevent and subdue affects, this seems to open room for considering affects not merely a “lack of virtue” but a morally culpable lack of virtue, thus something blameworthy.¹⁹

With respect to Kant’s seeming affirmation that one can be, to some degree, morally responsible for affects, we need to distinguish between moral responsibility for actions motivated by affects, and responsibility for the affects themselves. Kant’s imagery of affects as like the “bursting of a dam” (A 7:252) is apt. Occasionally, as when one’s child falls into the water or one experiences a sudden and shocking harm or insult, affect comes over one like a flood that overtops the dam in an instant: “All affects surprise us, but some surprise us so suddenly that we cannot prepare ourselves for it in the slightest” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1342). But often affects rise in a swell, and it is only by “abandoning oneself” or “giving oneself over” that these rising feelings become uncontrollable. Even when this abandonment is largely passive, a matter of simply letting feelings slip out of control, it is still something that we could have done something about: “We are blameworthy when we let ourselves come into the throes of affect; but when we are already in it, we are not capable of pulling ourselves out of it and then are not blameworthy” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1342). Moreover, there are longer-term strategies that one can employ to make oneself less susceptible to affects, practicing strategies of calming and refusing to cultivate a heightening of those emotions that are already most likely to lead to affect. Even if there is no responsibility for what one does when one is overpowered by affect, there are many ways that one can maintain and promote self-control before that point. And since all affects undermine the capacity for self-governance, one should constantly strive to eradicate them in one’s life. Insofar as one

¹⁹ A further complicating aspect of Kant’s account is even more troubling, since Kant sometimes seems to suggest that affects, at least those considered “rational affects,” can be morally *praiseworthy* (cf. Kant, ‘Essay on the Maladies of the Head’ 2:267, KU 5:272, SF 7:86; Sorenson (2002), 121; Clewis (2009), 170). However (contra Sorenson), Kant does not endorse any rational affect as morally required or even morally recommended. His apparent ambiguity is due to the fact that this particular affect is a sign of a moral predisposition in human beings and can thus provide an antidote to extreme pessimism about the possibility of morally good action. The presence of rational affects (particularly enthusiasm) indicates humans’ moral predispositions and thereby enduring capacities for virtue, but enthusiasm does not represent a genuine choice to act in accordance with moral ideas and thus cannot be considered morally praiseworthy. While “enthusiasm . . . seems to be sublime,” in fact “it cannot in any way merit a satisfaction of reason” (KU 5:272, emphases added; cf. MS 6:409); it is “fraught with danger” (SF 7:85) and “deserves censure” (SF 7:86). In fact, “to the extent they turn into affect . . . the noblest agitations of the mind are the most harmful” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:591) since even if “an affect . . . is directed to something good, then [it is] not yet thereby excused, for [it] then must also be constituted this way according to the form” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:591; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1119).

fails in that striving towards virtue, one deserves censure and can be held responsible for moral failing. When they become a “lack of virtue” with which one is complacent, affects cross the line into moral evil.

6. Conclusion

Affects and passions inhibit moral action and even prudence. Affects interfere with proper willing by bypassing the higher faculty of desire altogether, as in cases such as shock and outbursts of rage. In that sense, they are intense versions of relatively ordinary non-moral motivation, as when we do something by habit. They are “merely” a lack of virtue, but this is no small thing, and it should be avoided (apathy). Passions inhibit by fixating attention on a single inclination and blinding one to all other inclinations. They are consistent with means–end reasoning, and even with reasoning about subordinate ends, but, in the case of a passion, all reasoning takes place in the context of one’s overriding passion. Thus passions are a sort of extreme case of radical evil, where one’s fundamental maxim, rather than merely subordinating morality to happiness, subordinates both morality and happiness to the end of a particular inclination. They are properly evil and are “fixed” in the same way that evil itself is.

*The inclination toward freedom**Paul Guyer*

Some features of Kant's moral philosophy seem to have emerged fairly early in his development: for example, the idea that genuine obligation can derive only from "an end which is necessary in itself," while "recommendations to adopt a suitable procedure, if one wishe[s] to attain a given end," where that end is not necessary in itself, cannot give rise to genuine obligation, was already present in Kant's 1764 *Inquiry Concerning the Distinctness of the Principles of Natural Theology and Morality* (UD 2:298), and the terminology that recommendations of suitable procedures to attain given ends that are not necessary in themselves are "conditional" or "hypothetical" while commands to perform actions that are necessary for ends that are necessary in themselves are "categorical" was in place by the following year, as notes that Kant made in his copy of another work from 1764, *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*, demonstrate (Ri 115–16, 119–20). But what I argue to be the fundamental idea of Kant's mature moral philosophy, that the end that is necessary in itself is nothing other than the freedom of rational beings to set their own ends, thus of all rational beings that interact with each other to set their own ends in harmony or consistently with each other – which is to say, since we "know of only one species of rational beings on earth; namely, the human species," (A 7:329) the freedom of all human beings to set their own ends but in harmony with each other – did not emerge until more than a decade later. Then, this idea did emerge explicitly in Kant's *Lectures on Ethics* in the form in which he gave them between 1777 and 1784–5 and in the sole surviving transcription of his lectures on natural right, the *Naturrecht Feyerabend* of 1784–5, as well as, although in different terminology, in the *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. The question I wish to address in this chapter is whether, and if so when, the development of Kant's central idea in moral philosophy became reflected in his lectures on anthropology; where, in his discussion of the faculty of desire, Kant describes the natural inclinations and predispositions of human beings that are relevant to their

achievement of morality and that can be cultivated for the sake of this achievement.

What I will argue is that while Kant asserted the existence of a powerful inclination to one's *own* freedom as the condition of the possibility of one's own *happiness* early in the series of anthropology lectures that have survived, it was only later that he introduced the idea that freedom is more than this, but also something of intrinsic value suited to be an end in itself, and only even later that he suggested that alongside each human's inclination for his own happiness there may also be an "enthusiasm" for freedom in general. But although in the lectures on pedagogy published near the end of his life, edited by his student Friedrich Theodor Rink, Kant did suggest a little detail about how the native inclination of each for his own freedom actually may be transformed into such enthusiasm for freedom more generally, under the tutelage of children by their parents and teachers as moral educators, Kant never developed an account of this transformation within the lectures on anthropology. Perhaps this was because his course on anthropology focused more on the hindrances to morality that we find within human nature than on the assistance human nature might offer to our rational nature, the latter, indeed, not being much emphasized even in Kant's main writings on moral philosophy.

In what follows, I will first say only a few words about freedom as the end that is necessary in itself, and then illustrate at more length the development of Kant's thought about the inclination to freedom and its cultivation and education in his anthropological and pedagogical lectures.

I. Freedom as the inner worth of the world

I will treat Kant's idea that freedom itself is the only end that is necessary in itself briefly here, since I have treated it frequently and at more length elsewhere.¹ Kant introduces, without any apparent argument, the idea that "freedom according to a choice that is not necessitated to act" but is "restrained under certain rules of conditioned employment" is the "inner worth of the world, the *summum bonum*," and "the essential end of mankind" in the lectures on ethics in the version recorded as early as the summer semester of 1777 and as late as the winter semester 1784–5, shortly

¹ See, among others, Guyer (1993), 43–89, reprinted in Guyer (2000), 129–71; Guyer (1995), 231–62; English version in Guyer (2000), 96–125; Guyer (1996), 404–23; Guyer (1998), 22–35; Guyer (2007), 87–95; Guyer (2011), 194–214; and Guyer (2013).

following which the *Groundwork* was published.² Kant also describes the “highest *principium* of life” as the “greatest possible use of freedom,” the only conditions under which “freedom can be consistent with itself” or “under which it can be self-consistent” (Kant (2004), 179–80; VMo-*Collins*, 27:346). The idea of freedom as the necessary end on which morality is based is also present in the introduction to Kant’s lectures on natural right as recorded by Gottfried Feyerabend (according to the title page of his notebook, these lectures were given in the winter semester of 1784, but according to the catalogue of the University of Königsberg they were given in the preceding summer semester³ – in either case, they were given close to the time of Kant’s composition of the *Groundwork*). Here Kant says, in terms with which we are familiar from the latter work, “The human being is an end, hence it contradicts itself that he should be a mere means,” but further, “The inner worth of the human being rests on his freedom, that he has his own will. Because he is the ultimate end, his will must depend on nothing else” (VNR-*Feyerabend* 27:1319). Kant stresses that it is the freedom of human beings that makes them ends in themselves, not their rationality: “If only rational beings can be ends in themselves, this is not because they have reason, but because they have freedom. Reason is merely a means . . . Reason does not give us dignity . . . But freedom, only freedom alone, makes us ends in ourselves” (VNR-*Feyerabend* 27:1321–2). Kant does not explain why freedom makes us ends in ourselves, but with the help of the lectures on ethics we can at least figure out what he means by saying that reason is the means to this end: reason is the faculty that allows us to formulate consistent rules, so it is reason that allows us to figure out how to make sure that freedom is consistently treated as an end in itself when we have the possibility of multiple exercises of freedom and multiple free agents before us – as we always do.

This point understood, we can see the outlines of Kant’s idea that the inner worth of the world and the inner worth of mankind are the same, namely freedom, and that we need to use reason to figure out the rules – the moral rules – that will allow us to realize the greatest possible use of freedom. That Kant is developing the same idea in the *Groundwork* may not be obvious because, in its first two sections, where Kant is laying

² See the transcription by Johann Friedrich Kaehler dated summer semester, 1777, edited by Werner Stark as Kant (2004), 177–8, and VMo-*Collins* 27:344–5. Collins’s notes were probably copied from an earlier transcription going back to or having a common source with the Kaehler transcription, since his notes are virtually identical to Kaehler’s, but considerably different from the overlapping portion of “Morality According to Professor Kant” transcribed by Carl Coelestin Mrongovius also in the winter semester 1784–5 (see VMo-*Mrongovius* 29:597–629).

³ See Gerhard Lehmann’s introduction to *Akademie* edition, Volume 27, part 2.2 (27:1053).

out the content of the moral law on the basis first of his analysis of the common-sense concepts of good will and duty and then on the basis of his analysis of the philosophical concept of a categorical imperative, he does not explicitly discuss freedom, and then, in the third section, when he introduces it, he uses the fact of our freedom as the middle step in his proof that the moral law thus analyzed really does apply to us and is not a mere “phantom,” but he does not further analyze the content of the moral law. Instead, in Section II, Kant states that the idea of humanity – that is, rational being in the only form in which we are acquainted with it – is the “ground of a possible categorical imperative”; it is that which can serve as the only objective and necessary end, “something the *existence of which in itself* has an absolute worth” that can only be fully realized if we act in accordance with the categorical imperative as thus far defined, the requirement to act only on maxims that can also serve as universal laws, and that makes it rational for a rational being to bind itself by that rule (G 4:428, original emphasis).

However, what Kant means by rational being or its manifestation in human form is the same as what he means by freedom, or the freedom to set ends, and there is no difference between the doctrine of the *Groundwork* and the doctrine of Kant’s lectures on ethics and natural right. For later in Section II of the *Groundwork*, in summing up his several formulations of the categorical imperative, Kant says, “Rational nature is distinguished from the rest of nature” simply “by this, that it sets itself an end” (G 4:437), and a dozen years later, in the “Doctrine of Virtue” of the *Metaphysics of Morals*, a work in which he is explicitly and exclusively discussing the manifestation of rational being in human form and the duties that this entails specifically for human beings, Kant says that humanity is that by which a human being alone “is capable of setting himself ends” (MS 6:387), and, “The capacity to set oneself an end – any end whatsoever – is what characterizes humanity (as distinguished from animality)” (MS 6:392). And if humanity is simply the capacity to set our own ends freely, then treating humanity as the necessary end – that is, always making humanity an end and never merely a means – is the same as making freedom itself our ultimate end, or the greatest possible use of freedom our essential end.⁴ Though he expresses

⁴ There has been extensive discussion of what Kant means by the idea of humanity as an end in itself, triggered by Richard Dean (2006). Dean argued that in order to make any ends whatsoever morally permissible or even mandatory, it cannot be the capacity to set ends as such that is humanity, the necessary end and the ground of any possible categorical morality, but the good will, or setting only morally acceptable or mandatory ends. The way in which I have put his claim should make clear that I think it circular and question-begging, as I do Henry Allison’s response to Dean that it can

it in different words in his lectures and in his published works, this idea is thus the core of Kant's mature moral philosophy.

Thus by the middle of the 1780s Kant had reached the view that the freedom to set our own ends – not each of us on his or her own, rather each of us in interaction with all the rest of humankind – is the necessary end that is the ground of a possible categorical imperative and the basis of morality. Our task now is to see whether, and if so how, this idea makes itself known in his lectures on anthropology.

2. The inclination to freedom

Kant's anthropology lectures clearly recognize that we each have a powerful inclination on behalf of *our own* freedom; the question is whether this is simply an inclination that must be suppressed for us to become moral, or whether it can be transformed into a favorable attitude toward the freedom of all. Our conclusion can only be that while there may be hints of the latter idea in Kant's lectures, it is hardly fully developed.

Kant's anthropology lectures, like the handbook he published for them in 1798, after he had stopped giving them, begin with a discussion of the empirical factors affecting our capacities for cognition, feeling, and desire. His central concern in his discussion of the faculty of desire is our inclinations and the effects they may have, for better or worse, on our efforts to be moral. What I am particularly interested in is Kant's treatment of our *inclination to be free* and its relation to morality. And what I will argue is that for at least the first decade of his lecturing on anthropology Kant recognized only an inclination to *our own, individual* freedom as a condition of our own, individual *happiness*; that at around the time of the *Naturrecht Feyerabend* and the *Groundwork* he introduced the idea of freedom, not our own freedom but freedom as such, as the fundamental moral value; but that while this is to some extent reflected in the lectures on anthropology from this period, Kant did not really offer an account of how the natural inclination to our own freedom can be transformed into a morally helpful enthusiasm toward the freedom of all. He may have pointed in that direction in the lectures on pedagogy, but they remain beyond the purview of this chapter.

only be the *capacity* for a good will that can be humanity (see Allison (2011), 218–29). My own view is that the potential problem of valorizing morally impermissible ends is solved by the fact that it is not just *my* freedom or *yours* that is the end in itself but *all instances of freedom*. That this is the necessary end brings the necessary constraint along with it, namely the constraint of consistency, or the “greatest possible use of freedom” that Kant introduced in the lectures.

In the lectures on anthropology, Kant always presents the inclination to freedom as one of two “general” or “formal inclinations” that we have, alongside the inclination to resources or means (*Vermögen*). These inclinations are general or formal in the sense that they are not inclinations for objects – that is, immediate sources of gratification, such as inclinations for wine, women, or song might be considered to be. In the *Friedländer Lectures* of 1775–6, Kant introduces the two general inclinations and describes the inclination to freedom thus:

We can think of two objects of inclination which are completely general, where the inclinations have no object, but aim for means to satisfy the inclinations. These are freedom and resources. Freedom is a negative resource. If I am free, then I obtain nothing thereby. One can always be free, and still be needy. However, freedom is a negative condition of all satisfaction of our inclination. Whoever is not free cannot live how he wants, but if he is free, then he can live according to his own sense, if, namely, the other resources are presupposed. Freedom is therefore highly valued since it is the sole condition for being able to satisfy his inclinations. . . . Freedom is therefore a general object for satisfying the entirety of inclination. This is therefore the first good that humans wish for themselves, and yet they cannot avail themselves of it, but it must be restricted. (VA-Friedländer 25:581–2)⁵

Similar statements can already be found in the transcriptions from Kant’s first version of the anthropology course in 1772–3. Thus in the Collins transcription, we find this statement:

The general condition of all inclinations is freedom and resources. I cannot hope that my condition will be in accord with my inclination if I am not free, the inclination to freedom is the highest [strongest], because it is the condition of all inclinations. The most terrifying condition for a human being is when another always determines his condition, and takes care of the happiness of the former in accordance with his own inclination. (VA-Collins 25:214)⁶

And in the Parow transcription from the same course, we find:

We can consider all inclinations from 2 points of view.

- (1) In so far as they are the general condition of all inclinations, and one can call this the inclination *in abstracto*.

⁵ I have benefited from but slightly revised the translation of the Friedländer transcripts by G. Felicitas Munzel. I will note my departures from the translations in this volume only when I consider them significant.

⁶ Georg Ludwig Collins (1763–1814) was matriculated at the university in Königsberg only in 1784–5, and dated his copy of the anthropology lectures, made in his own hand, in 1786; his transcription is assigned to the course from 1772–3 because of its similarity to other transcriptions of that course, and must have been copied from one of those or from a common source.

(2) In so far as the objects of the inclinations are divided.

The general condition of all inclinations is freedom and resources. Freedom signifies precisely the condition in which one can live in accord with one's inclinations, hence humans also have a remarkable inclination to freedom, merely because it is the sole condition under which we can satisfy our inclinations . . .

Yet freedom is only a negative condition under which the human being can satisfy his inclinations. To freedom there must also be added resources . . . Resources [are] the power by means of which one can realize what is in accord with our choice [*Willkühr*]. (VA-Parow 25:417–18)

These passages are straightforward, but several comments on them are in order. First, of course, when Kant says that the inclination to freedom is the condition of *all* inclinations, obviously he means that it is the condition of all other, particular, and we might say, in contrast to “abstract,” concrete inclinations, inclinations for particular objects or kinds of object, such as, again, wine, women, and song; otherwise his position would be circular. In one way, this applies to the inclination for resources, too: for the normal person, at least, resources – which include not only money but also reputation, honor, health, natural powers, talents, and facility (see VA-Collins 25:214, VA-Parow 25:418, and VA-Friedländer, 25:582–3); that is, whatever allows one to get what one wants, either by one's own efforts (health, natural power, talents, and facility) or by getting others to provide what one wants (money and reputation) – are not the immediate objects of inclination, but desired only as means to possible ends; only in aberrational cases, such as the case of the miser or one obsessed with his own reputation, do these goods become immediate objects of inclination, ends rather than mere means.⁷ Kant does not explicitly say that freedom may be a condition of obtaining resources, but sometimes of course it may be: some people are born with a silver spoon in their mouth, and may not need freedom to acquire resources, but others may need freedom to acquire resources, and of course even those born to wealth may need freedom, say from a spendthrift trust, to expend their resources as they please, so freedom may be the condition of the use, if not of the acquisition, of resources, and thus the general condition of resources as well as of the pursuit of the satisfaction of particular inclinations; and perhaps this is what Kant means to signal when he says that freedom is the “highest” (*allerhöchste*) or “strongest” (*allerstärkste*) inclination (see VA-Collins 25:214n1).

⁷ The frugal Kant was fascinated with the case of the miser, perhaps worried about drawing a border between his own reasonable frugality and irrational miserliness, and discussed it often; for one prominent discussion, see VMO-Collins 27:399–407.

Second, or further, Kant sometimes describes the general inclinations as inclinations for the conditions that make *happiness* possible. In the Collins transcription, he says this about the inclination for resources: “people often value the resources to make themselves happy” (VA-Collins 25:214). But in the Mrongovius transcription, from 1784–5, he explicitly describes the inclination to freedom as an inclination toward the general condition of happiness:

There are 2 formal inclinations, the inclination to freedom and to resources – (freedom is the negative condition – the human being can only satisfy his inclinations if nothing hinders him and then he has freedom). The former is the inclination to determine oneself according to one’s own inclinations and to be free from the inclinations of others. It is therefore really a negative condition, by means of which the satisfaction of my inclinations is not promoted but hindrances thereto are merely swept out of the way. I do not thereby acquire anything but only make myself independent of the inclinations of others . . . Freedom is the first thing human beings demand, the human being does not satisfy complete freedom to the highest good. I can only hope to be happy and satisfied in accordance with my own concepts, but then I must have freedom. Freedom is thus the basis of the hope for happiness. (VA-Mrongovius 25:1354)

But this way of expressing the generality or formality of freedom (or resources) as an object of inclination represents no change in Kant’s view that freedom (or resources) is the condition for the satisfaction of other, more particular inclinations, for the simple reason that for Kant happiness is never anything other than the comprehensive satisfaction of particular inclinations, and the inclination or desire for happiness is not an inclination or desire alongside our other particular desires, but just the supervenient desire to satisfy our various desires, whatever they may be, or at least as many of them as can be conjointly satisfied. Kant expresses this point in the Friedländer transcription when he states, “Love of life and of happiness is no special inclination, but the general condition of the satisfaction of all inclinations” (VA-Friedländer 25:584), and of course he frequently makes this point in his main published works on moral philosophy as well.⁸ Freedom may be the general condition for the achievement of happiness, but insofar as happiness is nothing but the collective satisfaction of particular

⁸ For example, “all the elements that belong to the concept of happiness are without exception empirical – that is, they must be borrowed from experience” (G 4:418); and happiness “is still only the general name for subjective determining grounds, and it determines nothing specific about [them] . . . That is to say, in what each has to put his happiness comes down to the particular feeling of pleasure and displeasure in each and, even within one and the same subject, to needs that differ as this feeling changes” (KpV 5:25).

inclinations, freedom remains the general condition for the satisfaction of such inclinations, and the inclination to freedom is more general and “higher” than those particular inclinations.

Next, note that in these passages the kind of freedom that Kant stresses is freedom from interference in the pursuit of one’s particular ends *from other people*. This was evident in the passage from Collins, where Kant said that nothing is more terrible for a person than that *another* (*ein anderer*), that is, another person, impose his own inclination on the former, and in a further statement, which I did not previously quote: “People always take great pleasure in conquering [*besiegen*] others” (VA *Collins* 25:214). In a sentence I elided from my previous quote from Parow, Kant says, “It is therefore quite ridiculous when a landowner treats his subjects in his own way, and forces them to live according to his own conception of happiness” (VA-*Parow* 25:417). And in a sentence I also omitted from my previous quotation from Friedländer, Kant says that freedom is denied if “someone takes the responsibility for another’s happiness upon himself, but in such a way that he” – that is, the latter – “entirely loses his freedom, and it” – that is, the latter’s happiness, “is to depend merely on his” – that is, the former’s, “will” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:581). The last two passages make the same point that Kant would make years later in the *Metaphysics of Morals*, namely that it is right and indeed obligatory to promote the happiness of others, but only under *their own* conception of their happiness – that is, that which they freely form for themselves (MS 6:388) – while by contrast it is wrong even to promote their happiness only in accordance with *one’s own* conception thereof. The first quotation might be taken to suggest instead that it is wrong to impose or dominate others for the satisfaction of one’s own inclination, or one’s own happiness. If so, all three statements together state that it is wrong to interfere with the freedom of others whether that is just for the sake of one’s own happiness – that is, for the gratification of some immediate inclination or inclinations of one’s own – or even to promote their happiness, but only on one’s own conception of their happiness – which would, after all, ultimately be nothing more than a product of one’s own inclination also.

That Kant is conceiving of the relevant hindrance to freedom in these passages only as one person’s interference with another, specifically the imposition of one person’s inclinations upon another, might be surprising, for in earlier material related to his anthropology, namely his notes in his own copy of the 1764 *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*, itself arguably his first anthropological publication, he had also stressed that it is important that we not be dominated by *our own*

inclinations. In these notes, to be sure, Kant also stressed our intense disinclination for domination by others, thus by implication our intense inclination toward freedom from such domination by others, and indeed also in phrases that echo throughout the subsequent *Anthropology Lectures* and even in *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, published more than thirty years after these notes were made. Thus Kant writes,

Nothing can be more appalling than that the action of one human stand under the will of another. Hence no abhorrence can be more natural than that which a person has against servitude. On this account a child cries and becomes bitter if it has to do what another wants without one having first made an effort to make that pleasing to him. (Ri 68)

And further,

No misfortune can be more terrifying to one who is accustomed to freedom, who has enjoyed the good of freedom, than to see himself delivered to [*crossed out: under*] a creature of his own kind who can compel him to do what he will (to give himself over to his will [*Willens*]). (Ri 70–1)

Such passages make the same point that Kant is making in the anthropology lectures. But there are also passages in these notes that suggest that freedom lies in freedom from domination by *one's own* inclinations, or at least in the control of some of one's inclinations so that one can better gratify others, for example the restriction of one's inclinations to those that are readily satisfied with minimal means, since, after all, as we have seen, the role of freedom, at least so far, is to be the condition of happiness, and without *some* inclinations to satisfy, there is of course no possibility of happiness, since happiness is constituted by the satisfaction of (some coherent set of) inclinations. Thus Kant writes in one note, "A person's contentment arises either from satisfying many inclinations with many agreeable things, or from not letting many inclinations sprout, and thus by being satisfied with fewer fulfilled needs." The latter is of course the easier path to contentment or happiness, since the fewer things one needs to satisfy one's inclinations, the more likely one is to be able to satisfy them. Indeed, Kant even goes so far as to say,

Virtue does not at all consist in overcoming acquired inclinations in particular cases, but in seeking to be free of such inclinations and thus learning to do without them gladly. It does not consist in conflict with the natural inclinations, but rather in making it the case that one has none except for the natural ones, because these can always be satisfied. (Ri 60)

The assumption in all of this is that happiness lies in being able to satisfy a set of inclinations that one can reasonably expect to satisfy; obviously, this cannot require the elimination or suppression of inclination altogether, but it does require both that one be able to be free from interference by others in attempting to satisfy what would otherwise be reasonable inclinations and also that one be free from domination by one's own "unnatural" or unreasonable inclinations – that is, ones that cannot reasonably be expected to be readily satisfied – so that one can satisfy one's reasonable and "natural" inclinations – that is, those one can reasonably expect to be able to satisfy readily. (Reasonable inclinations are "natural" for Kant since, from his always teleological point of view, nature herself would only give us inclinations that it would also give us the means to satisfy. One way of describing the change from the "pre-critical" to the "critical" Kant would be to say that his pervasive teleology is transformed from a constitutive to a regulative principle (see Guyer (2009), 57–97).)

I have said that Kant has introduced the inclination for freedom as the highest general condition for *happiness*, and that seems like a non-moral conception of this inclination. The remark from the notes on the *Observations*, written almost a decade before the anthropology lectures commenced, that freedom from domination by acquired and unnatural inclinations is a condition for *virtue*, might suggest that this inclination is specifically moral, but since the virtue that Kant has described concerns the ready satisfaction of inclinations – that is, happiness – and at least by Kant's later lights virtue is of course not immediately concerned with happiness, but only with the worthiness to be happy, the concept of virtue that he has introduced here seems to be, again by his later lights, non-moral or pre-moral. Freedom has been presented only as a condition for the possibility of happiness, not as a condition for worthiness of happiness. I will return to this issue shortly, but first I want to make my next point about these anthropological passages we have been considering, namely that the freedom that Kant is talking about here is strictly freedom of choice, which can be understood, as far as anything in these materials goes, in a naturalistic way, compatibly with the determinism that we can presume that Kant always assumed to prevail in the natural world. Although he has used the term *Wille* in some of these descriptions of what one wants to be free from – one wants to be free from hindrance by the *Wille* of others in one's pursuit of happiness after one's own conception of it – this term does not yet carry any metaphysical weight for Kant; it is not yet equivalent to pure practical reason or to "transcendental," libertarian freedom, the freedom to originate a chain of effects without any antecedent

cause or to choose either of two alternatives before one no matter what one's past history might seem to predict one will choose. Even if he might later reject this as the "freedom of a turnspit" (KpV 5:97), here Kant is only talking about freedom as he already understood it in 1755, as the issuance of an action from a person's own "*inner principle*"; that is, from her own representation of "*what is best*" rather than from someone else's (see PND 1:401–2). Freedom from domination by one's own but unnatural or acquired inclinations may also be understood as action determined by an inner rather than external principle, namely one's own natural inclinations combined with one's natural reason, one's natural ability to reflect on which of one's inclinations may be readily satisfied and which not. Again, there is no hint of a libertarian conception of freedom of the will or any of Kant's later metaphysics here. Kant signals all of this, I believe, by his use of the term *Willkühr* in the passages we have been discussing, for example the passage from Parow (VA-Parow 25:418). *Willkühr* is just the ordinary term for choice, selection, what is voluntary, and so on, with no metaphysical freight. Thus the freedom for which we have such a strong inclination is, at least from the point of view of Kant's anthropology, nothing other than the freedom to pursue our own inclinations and thus our own conception of happiness free from hindrance by other people or even from our own but unnatural inclinations; this does not imply that our natural inclinations or considered preferences are not themselves causally determined – presumably they are called natural at least in part just because they are.⁹

Another point that Kant makes in our original passage from Friedländer is that the freedom that we so desire must be restricted (*eingeschränkt*) (VA-Friedländer 25:582). What he means by this becomes clear in the Mrongovius transcription, where he states that there are two kinds of freedom; by this he means not that there is mere preference that can be causally determined and some deeper, metaphysical freedom, but rather that there is "civil freedom" "under laws" and "barbaric freedom" "without laws"

⁹ Thus I disagree with Holly Wilson's suggestion that the anthropology lectures invoke the distinction between *Wille* and *Willkühr* that Kant introduced in *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason* (see Wilson (2006), 64–5). Robert Louden stresses the importance of freedom in Kant's anthropology (e.g. Louden (2000), 67), but does not raise the question whether this should be understood naturalistically or transcendently. In his detailed study of the anthropology lectures, Thomas Sturm seems ultimately to conclude, as I have, that Kant's conception of action and thus of freedom in the lectures is intended to remain empirical, or, as I have called it, naturalistic, and not to invoke Kant's transcendental idealist theory of freedom (see Sturm (2009), e.g. 452). G. Felicitas Munzel (2012) argues that the Doctrine of Method of the first *Critique* already implies a theory of the education of "inner freedom," and does not doubt that Kant's lectures on anthropology and pedagogy employ the same conception of freedom (see her [Chapter 4](#)).

(VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1354) – that is, freedom with laws that by restricting the freedom of each to some degree turn out to maximize the freedom of each, and freedom without laws, which might seem to maximize the freedom of each but ends up minimizing or destroying the freedom of many, if not all. This distinction is, of course, the basis of Kant’s philosophy of right, the most general principle of which is precisely, “Right is . . . the sum of the conditions under which the choice [*Willkühr*] of one can be united with the choice of another in accordance with a universal law of freedom” (MS 6:230). But I do not intend to discuss the foundations of Kant’s political philosophy here; rather the final point that I want to make about the passages we have thus far been considering is that the freedom to which we have such a strong inclination is freedom negatively conceived, freedom *from* hindrance by anything else, other people or unnatural inclinations, that would get in the way of our successfully pursuing a reasonable set of preferences for ourselves. Kant makes this point in one sense in his contrast between the inclination to freedom and the inclination for resources: freedom from interference, although it can be called “the first good which human beings wish for themselves” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:582), is a “negative condition” in contrast to the resources such as health and wealth which are “a positive basis for procuring the actuality of the object” of any particular, immediate inclination. “Or freedom is only a negative condition,” to which resources “must be added” (VA-*Parow* 25:417). The absence of hindrances to the pursuit of one’s own ends may be a necessary, but it is certainly not a sufficient, condition for the realization of those ends; to that necessary condition must be added at least resources as adequate means to their realization, as well as, no doubt, some luck. But there is another sense in which freedom from hindrance is only a negative condition, namely that even though it is only a necessary and not a sufficient condition for the satisfaction of inclinations that will constitute one’s happiness, it is the object of one’s inclination, even one’s strongest inclination, *only* because it is a necessary condition for the satisfaction of other inclinations and thus for one’s happiness; it has no independent value, no intrinsic value; it is not a value in its own right. It may be the greatest of all means, but not an end in itself, let alone the sole end in itself.

That freedom, in some sense, is an end in itself, or indeed *the* end in itself, and for that reason the essential end of mankind is, I claim, the central idea of Kant’s mature moral philosophy. So the anthropology lectures from the 1770s (and even the *Mrongovius* transcription, though dated 1784–5) do not yet reflect Kant’s mature moral philosophy, or suggest how our native inclination to freedom might be enlisted in the cause of

morality as the mature Kant conceives it. We will now see that one version of the anthropology that does clearly date to the first part of the 1780s does recognize that freedom is not only a (negative) necessary condition for the satisfaction of inclination and realization of happiness, but also an end in its own right, although it does not yet suggest that our natural inclination for freedom in the first role can be transformed into a motive to realize freedom in the second. This text is *Menschenkunde*.

3. Value added

The text first published by Johann Adam Bergk, using the pseudonym “Fr. Ch. Starck,” under the title *Immanuel Kant’s Menschenkunde oder philosophische Anthropologie*, was based on material that has been assigned different dates, most recently, by Reinhard Brandt, to 1781–2, on the ground that the text uses phrases that Kant used for the first time only in the *Critique of Pure Reason*.¹⁰ Of course, such phrases could have crept into an earlier text during Bergk’s editing, which took place many years later. It seems safest just to say that the material probably originated during Kant’s critical period but before the final phase of his work in the 1790s. In any case, what is crucial for our purposes is that the text does add a new strand to Kant’s thought about the psychology of freedom.

In the discussion of inclination, which comes at its usual place in the course of lectures,¹¹ Kant first makes his usual distinction between the “formal inclinations” to freedom and resources, and gives his usual definition of freedom in negative terms, namely, “Freedom signifies liberation from hindrances to living according to our own inclination” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1142). He adds that hindrances to our freedom come not from nature but from other people, thus “our inclination to freedom is directed only to human beings” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1143). His premise here, which goes back to his notes in the *Observations* (Ri 71), is that nature, in the sense of the physical environment, merely sets the conditions within which we can exercise our freedom, but only other human beings can willfully interfere with our ability to exercise our freedom within the limits of those conditions. Perhaps the ultimate source for Kant’s position here is indeed anthropological; that is, based in empirical psychology, namely in what Peter Strawson dubbed our “reactive attitudes”: as a matter of psychological fact, we do not resent the environmental conditions in which we find

¹⁰ See Robert Louden’s introduction to the translation of selections from *Menschenkunde* in *Lectures on Anthropology* (Louden (2007a)).

¹¹ But which is not translated in the editors’ selection for *Lectures on Anthropology*.

ourselves, but we do resent the interference of other human beings with our own attempts to do as best we can within these environmental conditions. Be that as it may, Kant continues with his usual observations: “The inclination to freedom is the greatest among all our inclinations”; “The human being feels unhappy even under the kindest master if he is to be happy in accordance with the inclination of his master. For everyone wants to be happy in accordance with his own inclination” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1143) – that is, his own conception of happiness, which is, of course, nothing but the sum of his (coherent) inclinations.

But then Kant adds a thought that we have not previously encountered in the anthropology lectures, namely, “Freedom is also a condition of the worth [*Werth*] of a human being, so that if one takes freedom from him, one takes from him the characteristic condition of his eminence [*Vorzugs*].” Now, *Vorzug* could also be translated as “superiority,” and Kant could just be making a further psychological point here, namely that if you deprive a person of his freedom you also deprive him of any feeling of superiority over others that he might have, you make him *feel* like a slave rather than a master. But Kant continues with characteristically moral rather than psychological language, so I do not think this is what he means. Rather, what he says next is,

Yet one sees that the ultimate end of the human being points to this, that he rule himself [*sich selbst regiere*], so that the human being loses all worth as soon as he stands under the dominance of another in such a way that it is no longer allowed to him to be happy in accordance with his own inclination. This judgment is confirmed [*bestätigt*] by experience. (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1143)

This construction is exactly the same as the one Kant uses in the central “fact of reason” passage in the *Critique of Practical Reason*, where he argues that the “order of concepts” when we infer from the universality and necessity of the moral law to the purity of our reason and will is “confirmed by experience” (*die Erfahrung bestätigt*), namely our experience of believing that we could refrain from bearing false testimony just because we know that we ought to do so (KpV 5:30). Thus Kant is introducing the central thesis of his morality of pure practical reason into his anthropology here, claiming that the value of freedom that is (somehow) grounded in pure reason alone is also made manifest to us in our empirical psychology.

Now, of course, the freedom that is so valued by morality is not just *one's own* freedom, but the freedom of *all*; in his crucial comment on the

formula of humanity in the *Groundwork* (which is, as I argued in section 1 above, the way in which Kant presents his idea of the fundamental value of freedom in that work), Kant says that each must value his own humanity (ability to set ends, thus freedom) “objectively” rather than merely “subjectively,” “on just the same rational ground” that holds for all. That is, in order to be moral each must value his own freedom not just as his own, but as an instance of freedom that is equally valuable in every being in which it occurs – and thus each must value the freedom of others equally with his own. But the inclination to freedom that Kant has thus far discussed in his anthropology lectures seems to be only an inclination to *one’s own* freedom, accompanied at best by the prudential realization that one may actually be able to attain more freedom for oneself by accepting some restriction in favor of the freedom of others (“civil freedom”) than by allowing no restriction of one’s own freedom (“barbaric freedom”). And indeed, as in the Mrongovius transcription, in *Menschenkunde* Kant follows the passage we have been considering with another statement of that distinction. But then he goes further. He states that “the inclination to freedom ennobles the human being” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1145), which he has not said in any of the other reports of his lectures, and it would not seem that an inclination only for one’s own freedom, merely as a condition of happiness rather than as the “ultimate end” of mankind, would be especially ennobling. And only after this remark does Kant suggest that children have an inclination to freedom that must not be merely curbed but encouraged, which would suggest that this is in some way a morally promising inclination to freedom in general and not just an inclination to their own freedom. He says:

The opinion of freedom is of very great importance; hence it is the responsibility of all those who have power to preserve [*erhalten*] this opinion in those who are under their power. For by that does one make it again at least somewhat good that one assumes power over them. Thus children should also be educated so that one always leaves them their freedom. One can so make it that when they do not do what we want yet one does not do something to them that is against what they want, and this freedom is an element at which one aims in the general effort in the art of education. For it is of no great use to train a child like a hound. The child must not find its advantage except in good conduct [*Wohlverhalten*], and then it sees that in time it must adopt rational maxims. (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1145–6)

Kant often says that we must make it seem to children that what we want them to do is in fact what they want to do, and this might sound like nothing more than manipulating their inclination for their own freedom

for our ends or to make them happy after our own conception of their happiness rather than theirs. But the opening and closing sentences of the paragraph suggest something more, namely that the child's opinion about freedom must be preserved, which suggests that it cannot be merely self-centered, but must already include some inclination in favor of the freedom of all, not just the child's own, and that if the child's opinion about freedom is properly preserved and cultivated, it will lead to the adoption of rational, which is to say moral, maxims, which likewise suggests that it must in some way be a inclination toward the freedom of all.

This paragraph might be a slender thread from which to hang the claim that Kant's anthropology now includes a natural inclination toward the freedom of all, but it at least suggests such a thought, and in any case Kant's remarks recorded in *Menschenkunde* clearly suggest that the idea that freedom is an ultimate end or value in itself and not just a necessary condition and thus a means for happiness, which is nothing but the satisfaction of particular inclinations, is part of our empirical psychology, something confirmed by experience.

4. From inclination to enthusiasm

We might hope to find a straightforward progression in Kant's thought on the inclination to freedom from a self-interested to a moral conception of it, and thus might expect to find the latter conception of this inclination further developed in his own published version of his anthropology, namely the *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* of 1798. But that might be too much to expect since this work, published as Kant was about to lose his ability to construct a coherent work from rich materials, as we know from the case of the *Opus postumum*, obviously drew on his own notes for his anthropology course, given as we have seen over a period of twenty-five years and in turn building on materials going back another ten years, namely the notes in his copy of the *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*. And in fact what he has to say about the inclination to freedom, indeed what he now calls "the inclination to freedom as a passion," is ambivalent, in some ways suggesting the more moralized conception of this inclination that we found suggested in *Menschenkunde*, and in other ways not. What he says in the published work needs to be quoted at some length. He starts by saying, "For the natural human being" "the inclination to freedom as a passion" "is the most violent inclination of all, in a condition where he cannot avoid making reciprocal claims on others." He then continues:

Whoever is able to be happy only according to *another* person's choice (no matter how benevolent this other person may be) rightly feels that he is unhappy. For what guarantee has he that his powerful fellow human being's judgment about his well-being will agree with his own? The savage (not yet habituated to submission) knows no greater misfortune than to have this befall him, and rightly so, as long as no public law protects him until the time when discipline has gradually made him patient in submission . . . Even the child who has just wrenched itself from the mother's womb seems to enter the world with loud cries, unlike all other animals, simply because it regards the inability to make use of its limbs as *constraint*, and thus it immediately announces its claim to freedom (a representation that no other animal has) . . . Mere hunting peoples . . . have really ennobled themselves by this feeling of freedom . . . Thus it is not only the concept of freedom under moral laws that arouses an affect, which is called enthusiasm [*Enthusiasm*], but the mere sensible representation of outer freedom heightens the inclination to persist in it or to extend it into a violent passion, by analogy with the concept of right. (A 7:268–9, original emphasis)

This passage is hard to interpret, for its opening suggests once again just that human beings naturally have an inclination toward their own freedom (for can infants really be thought to have an inclination toward the freedom of others?), and one that can indeed become violent. Yet Kant goes on to say that what is apparently this same inclination can ennoble some primitive peoples, and then he seems to shift ground yet again by suggesting that even if the natural and potentially passionate inclination toward one's own freedom is not the same thing as an inclination for the freedom of all, there is nevertheless an affect, thus also a psychological state or tendency, toward the "concept of freedom under moral laws" – that is, the freedom of all, not just oneself – a psychological state that can be called "enthusiasm" but obviously not in the pejorative sense that this term so commonly had for Enlightenment thinkers.¹² Perhaps we can only conclude that Kant thinks *either* that *within* the natural inclination to freedom, originally directed at one's own freedom, there is some sort of potential inclination to the freedom of all that can be developed with proper upbringing and education, *or* that alongside the inclination to one's own freedom there is also a natural potential for positive affect toward the freedom of all that can be developed with proper upbringing and education. Either way, proper upbringing and education can develop a proper enthusiasm for the

¹² See, for example, Locke's definition: "This I take to be properly Enthusiasm, which though founded neither on Reason, nor Divine Revelation, but rising from the Conceits of a warmed or over-weening Brain, works yet, where it once gets footing, more powerfully on the Perswasions and Actions of Men, than either of those two, or both together" (Locke (1975), 699).

freedom of all that can prevent our original inclination toward our own freedom from turning into a violent passion aimed exclusively at that, a passion that can lead to the desire for vengeance instead of justice that is “excitable” through “mere self-love” (A 7:270–1).

In the end, then, the published *Anthropology* does not tell us much about the proper upbringing and education that are needed to refine enthusiasm for the freedom of all from the inclination to freedom or to put the former into a position to govern the latter, and thus does not clearly develop what was at least hinted at in *Menschenkunde*. Whether Kant develops that hint elsewhere, for example in the lectures on pedagogy, will have to remain a question for another day.

CHAPTER 8

Empirical desire

Allen W. Wood

In the final published version of Kant's lectures on anthropology, *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* (1798), there are two main divisions: I. Anthropological didactic, which provides an exposition of the three main faculties of the mind – the cognitive faculty (A 7:127–229), the feeling of pleasure and displeasure (A 7:230–50), and the faculty of desire (A 7:251–82) – and II. Anthropological characteristic (A 7:283–333). The explicit subtitles of the two parts describe the first as “the art of cognizing the interior as well as the exterior of the human being” and the second as “the way of cognizing the interior of the human being from the exterior.” But the division might be better understood as reflecting Kant's distinction between “what nature makes of the human being” and “what he as a free-acting being makes of himself, or can and should make of himself” (A 7:119). The faculties of the mind, namely, constitute what nature provides us, and our character displays what we have made of ourselves.

These two sides or aspects of Kant's pragmatic anthropology were present almost from the beginning of his anthropology lectures a quarter-century before the published version. Both the Collins and the Parow transcriptions (dated 1772–3) proceed through a discussion of the three faculties, and then there occurs a section “On the character of the human being” that introduces the materials later treated as Part II (VA 25:5, 218, 241, 426). In the Friedländer transcription (1775–6), the second part is explicitly partitioned off as “II. Anthropologiae” (VA-Friedländer 25:468, 624). In the two more complete (not merely fragmentary) transcriptions of the 1780s – *Menschenkunde* (1781–2) and Mrongovius (1784–5), the explicit divisions are repeated (25:852, 1156, 1208, 1367). But the apparent sharpness of Kant's division between “didactic” and “characteristic” (between the part of human nature that is given through our faculties and the part we make through our free agency) is belied even by Kant's own treatments. “Characteristic” itself begins not with what is self-made but with the raw materials, so to speak, of human self-making: “the predispositions

indicating what can be made of the human being” – natural aptitude (*Naturell*) and temperament (A 7:285–91).

1. Desire

Kant defines “desire” (*Begierde*, *appetitus*) as “the self-determination of a subject’s power through the representation of something future as an effect of this representation” (A 7:251). A theoretical cognition is a representation of an object that corresponds to the object (KrV A57–8/B82–3; VL 8:85–6), and receptivity to the object (KrV A19–20/B33–4). Desire, by contrast, is the causality of a subject’s representation, having a future object as its effect. Here the object ought to correspond to the representation of it present in desire.

Even more significant, however, for the relation between “didactic” and “characteristic” (or between what nature makes of us and what we make of ourselves) is Kant’s characterization of desire as a *self-determination* of the subject’s power to bring about an object. Desires are never mere occurrences (*in* us or *to* us), to which our free agency is simply passive. Even in empirical desires we are already *self-determining*, thus always voluntarily complicit in desiring. Kant’s focus in his discussion of the faculty of desire is on both the feelings and the desires that pose obstacles to the rational agent, both from the standpoint of prudence and from the standpoint of morality, in the rational task of self-mastery and self-making.

2. Inclination

The central concept in Kant’s account of empirical desire is “inclination.” But this is a more specific and also a more complex concept than is usually appreciated. Much misguided discussion of Kant’s moral psychology tends simply to equate “inclination” with “desire” (as if “inclination” were merely Kant’s quaint eighteenth-century word for what we mean by “desire”). For Kant, every desire (*Begierde*) or impulse (*Antrieb*) is the representation of an object accompanied by a feeling of pleasure (*Lust*) (G 4:444; MS 6:211, 213; KpV 5:72, 116). In some desires (*empirical* desires) the feeling precedes and grounds the desire, whereas in others (*rational* desires), the desire itself (as a self-determination of the subject’s faculty of desire) comes first, and the pleasure is the effect of this determination (KpV 5:8–9n; MS 6:211–13). All action from *reasons* is action on a desire of the latter kind; and these desires are neither empirical impulses nor empirical desires – though they may rest on them, as when an instrumental reason serves an empirical

desire, or an empirical desire constitutes a part of the whole of well-being that we call our *happiness* (G 4:399, 418; MS 6:215–16, 480).

Inclination, in Kant's sense of the term, is a desire that is *not* rationally grounded in this way, but one where the feeling of pleasure accompanying a representation grounds the desire for the object, rather than the desire producing the feeling. Inclinations rest on instinct, which is the predisposition to be pleased by something even before one possesses it (cf. A 7:265; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1111–12; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1339; VA-*Busolt* 25:1518). Inclination requires acquaintance with the object, and even involves a self-determination of the faculty of desire: "Inclination is a determinate principle *to desire an object*, in so far as it is already known to me" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:584, original emphasis). Kant does sometimes use the term "inclination" to refer to the instinctive starting point in our animality for these more complex empirical desires, but his main account of inclination refers to the more complex notion in which maxims and the exercise of choice are involved. Inclinations (in this more complex sense) are not directly under our control, but our volition is nevertheless involved in them (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1338).

Inclination is "habitual sensible desire" (A 7:251; cf. VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1339; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1109; VA-*Busolt* 25:1519; MS 6:212). "Habitual" in this formulation is meant as the claim that the desire has been taken up into a rule or maxim of the subject's will. "A sensible desire that serves the subject as a rule (habit) is called 'inclination' (*inclinatio*)" (A 7:265). Thus an inclination is not for a particular object, but for objects of a general kind. "Inclinations are desires for objects of an entire genus [*Gattung*]" (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1140–1). An inclination is therefore not a mere momentary impulse, nor is it something coming to the subject merely from nature or "from outside." It is rather a desire in which the subject's free agency, in the form of choice, comparison, and conceptual generalization, also plays some part.

This voluntary feature of Kant's conception of inclination shows itself prominently in his account of the passions, to which we will return below. It also shows itself in his conception of the radical evil in human nature in Part One of *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*. There Kant argues that we have an innate (though freely acquired) *propensity* (*Hang*) to prefer incentives of self-love or inclination to those of duty (R 6:29, 32). Here "innateness" means that we must be regarded as having freely brought this propensity upon ourselves prior to any act in time in which it manifests itself (R 6:38). In the *Religion*, where Kant first genuinely thematizes these issues, he does not regard our animality as the enemy of

morality; nor, therefore, does he regard the natural or instinctual matter of our inclinations as the source of the resistance or counterweight to morality:

The ground of evil cannot be placed, as is commonly done, in the sensuous nature of the human being, and in the natural inclinations originating from it. For not only do those bear no direct relation to evil . . . but we also cannot presume ourselves responsible for their existence. (R 6:35)

The Stoics, he says, “mistook their enemy, who is not to be sought in the natural inclinations, which merely lack discipline and openly display themselves unconcealed to everyone’s consciousness, but is rather an invisible enemy, one who hides behind reason and is therefore all the more dangerous” (R 6:57).

3. The “general objects” of human inclination

Our instincts as living natural beings – what Kant calls our “animality” – give rise to a number of desires and satisfactions belonging to our nature, those connected with our survival as individuals, the survival of our species, and our sociability (A 7:321–2; R 6:26–7). We might think (and it belongs to the common images of Kant’s moral psychology) that the gratification of these natural desires would constitute the chief objects of our empirical desires or inclinations. But we saw above that “inclination” for Kant refers to a desire for a kind of object, not for individual objects. Thus when Kant explicitly inquires about “the objects of our inclinations,” he identifies certain general objects. Moreover, his account is strikingly at variance with any that might emphasize the natural, instinctive or animal content of our empirical desires.

To begin with, Kant distinguishes “formal” objects of empirical desire from “material” objects (VP 9:491; cf. VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1141, 1148; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1354). The latter relate directly to objects and specific ends of desire, such as delusion or pleasure. But Kant thinks that those objects of human inclination which are both powerful enough and determinate enough to pertain to human nature in general are not the “material” ones at all, but rather the “formal” ones. These do not include pleasure or gratification themselves, but concern instead the mere *possibility* of desire satisfaction. Kant identifies these formal objects as the *resources* (*Vermögen*) to obtain such satisfaction, and the *freedom* needed to direct our powers to the use of these resources. “We can think of two objects [*Gegenstände*] of inclination which are completely general, where the inclinations have

no object [*Object*], but aim for means to satisfy the inclinations. These are freedom and resources. Freedom is a negative resource" (VA-Friedländer 25:581; cf. VA-Collins 25:214).

Why does Kant locate the chief objects of our inclination in these formal objects – in the mere means to agreeableness or satisfaction, rather than directly in pleasure or gratification themselves, or in the natural objects that provide it? The deepest reason is that Kant does not think that happiness or contentment are among nature's ends for human beings (A 7:230–1, 326; cf. Idea 8:21; RH 8:64–5; MA 8:112–13; KU 5:430–1, G 4:417–19, 423). Consequently, as human desirers we are so formed by nature that we systematically prefer imaginary possible future satisfactions over actual present satisfactions, and what we empirically desire with greatest strength is the imagined means to these future satisfactions. In this way, Kant thinks, nature has formed our faculty of empirical desire in such a way that we remain discontented, and always motivated to develop faculties that benefit the species, but not the individual:

The concept of happiness is not one that the human being has, say, abstracted from his instincts and thus derived from the animality in himself; rather, it is a mere *idea* of a state to which he would make his instincts adequate under merely empirical conditions (which is impossible). He outlines this idea himself, and indeed, thanks to the involvement of his understanding with his imagination and his senses, in so many ways and with such frequent changes that even if nature were to be completely subject to his will it could still assume no universal and fixed law at all by means of which to correspond to the unstable concept and thus with the end that each arbitrarily sets himself. . . for his nature is not of the sort to call a halt anywhere in possession and enjoyment and to be satisfied. (KU 5:430, original emphasis; cf. G 4:417–19)

Here Kant shows his agreement with Rousseau, in the *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, who represents the human being in the animal state as contented, and ascribes all properly *human* misery (as well as all human *wickedness*) to the perfectibility of our reason. This is also the point of Kant's thesis, expressed early in the *Groundwork*, that nature would have hit on a very bad arrangement if it had given us reason only as a means to happiness, since reason is actually counterproductive to that end (G 4:395–6). It is a direct consequence of this idea that the most characteristic influential objects of human inclination do not consist in actual gratification, but rather in the imagined acquisition of means to imagined gratification, which always flees from us like a will-o'-the-wisp. "Human beings often prize the resources to make themselves happy – not his inclination to

gratification itself – higher than the satisfaction of inclination itself. Skills are often prized higher than their ends themselves, and this most strikingly meets our eyes in the case of money” (VA-*Collins* 25:214).

The *freedom* that constitutes a chief object of human inclination is the “external freedom” that grounds Kant’s theory of right, and constitutes the sole innate right each of us has in virtue of our humanity: “independence from being constrained by another’s choice” (MS 6:237). Freedom in this sense is the *social* condition of not having our actions constrained by the will of another:

I cannot hope that my condition will possibly conform to inclination if I am not free; the inclination for freedom is the highest of all, because it is the condition of all inclinations. The most terrible condition for a human being is that in which another human being determines his condition, and cares for his happiness in accordance with his inclinations. (VA-*Collins* 25:214; cf. VA-*Friedländer* 25:581)

“Whoever is able to be happy only according to another person’s choice (no matter how benevolent this other person may be) rightly feels that he is unhappy” (A 7:268).

When *resources* are regarded as a general object of human inclination, the concept is taken quite broadly, to include “1. Regard among human beings. 2. Health and skill or talent and 3. Money” (VA-*Collins* 25:214). “We can best express the 3 kinds of resources by strength, means, and reputation, with which health, riches, and honor are placed parallel” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:582; cf. VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1354). This trio is strikingly similar to the account Kant gives at the beginning of the *Groundwork* of the “gifts of fortune”: power, wealth, and honor, which, along with health and happiness, belong to the class of limited goods (which are truly good only when combined with a good will) (G 4:393). They also closely correspond, as we shall see presently, with the objects of the three “social” passions to which human beings are subject.

Freedom may be regarded as a “negative resource” in either of two senses. First, freedom (as independence from the will of another) is a *conditio sine qua non* of making *your own* use of whatever resources you have; and second, your freedom negates the resources of others, by constituting your exemption from the control that their resources enable them to exercise over you – their *strength to coerce* you through fear; their *money*, which controls you through the vulnerability of your needs as the means of their satisfaction; or their *honor* and regard among human beings, which may subject you to their control through human opinion (the opinions of

others to which you must pay some regard, or even through your own opinion).

When we find Kant claiming that inclination is the enemy of morality (G 4:405, 455; KpV 5:21–8; MS 6:376, 379–80), we should always think not of people's direct pursuit of such innocent satisfactions, but instead of the *social* context in which this pursuit takes place: the powerful need of human beings to assert their will in relation to others and to bring the wills of others under their own sway. By twisting and subverting our proper conceptions of self-valuation, social competitiveness also determines the psychology of self-regarding vices, such as mendacity, avarice, and servility. Self-regarding duties constitute no exception or counterexample whatever to the thesis that, for Kant, social competitiveness or unsociable sociability is the deepest source of all human vice and transgressions of moral duty (see Wood (2009); and Wood (2014)).

4. Affects

Throughout Kant's lectures on anthropology, the chief focus of his treatment of the faculty of desire is on feelings and inclinations that pose a threat to rational self-government, whether self-interested (prudential) or moral. His main division is between "affect" (*Affekt*) and "passion" (*Leidenschaft*). Kant tells us (VA-*Friedländer* 25:589; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1115) that he derives this distinction from Francis Hutcheson, whose major work was *Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections, with Illustrations on the Moral Sense* (London, 1728). It is questionable, however, whether Kant's conceptions are the same as Hutcheson's, and the distinction between affect and passion was also already present in the empirical psychology of Baumgarten.¹

Both affects and passions are "motions" or "agitations" of the mind (*Gemüthsbewegungen*), characterized by a loss of composure (VA-*Friedländer* 25:589) and an incapacity of the mind to make comparisons and estimate the relative value and importance of different feelings and desires in relation to a rational sum or whole (VA-*Collins* 25:212; VA-*Parow* 25:411; VA-*Friedländer* 25:590; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1340). The difference is that affects are *feelings* that destroy our composure and our ability to make rational comparisons, whereas passions are *inclinations* that do so. Kant modifies his account a bit in the published *Anthropology*. He still regards

¹ However, Kant may have derived his conception of passion at least in part from Hutcheson's treatment of the non-reflective passions, which can preoccupy and obstruct our reasoning, interfering both with desire for the public good and with our desire for our own good. See Hutcheson (1971), 28–30.

passions as inclinations that we cannot rationally compare with others or with a whole in deciding what to do; but in addition to saying the analogous thing about feelings in the case of affects (A 7:254), he also characterizes affects as feelings that take us by surprise, so that we cannot rationally decide whether to yield to them (A 7:251).

On either account, an affect is a sudden access of feeling that temporarily takes away our capacity for rational self-government. Kant distinguishes affects involving *agreeable* feelings (such as joy) from those that involve *disagreeable* feelings (such as sadness or grief) (A 7:254–5; cf. VA-Collins 25:215). He also distinguishes *sthenic* affects that come from strength (such as anger or laughter) from “asthenic” affects that come from weakness (such as fear or weeping) (A 7:255). All affects tend to be counterproductive to the subject’s ends, since they prevent the subject from reflecting on the situation and rationally deciding what to do (A 7:253); they are therefore opposed to prudence as well as to morality (VA-Parow 25:412, VA-Menschenkunde 25:1119). But some affects are also directly counterproductive to the very end involved in them – such as anger, which arouses hostility against us, or shame, which makes us incapable of doing what we are ashamed of being unable to do; both respond to an evil in precisely that way that does not avert it but brings it on ourselves (A 7:260). On the other hand, Kant thinks that nature implanted shame in us for a moral end: “The end of the susceptibility to shame, which nature placed in us is to necessitate the human being to truthfulness” (VA-Friedländer 25:599).

The *apathy* that Kant says is required for virtue is by no means an absence of feelings generally, since some feelings are even conditions of moral agency (MS 6:399–405); the apathy that he praises is instead the absence of affects, which makes rational self-government possible (MS 6:406–9; A 7:253). “It is not absence of feeling [*Gefühllosigkeit*], but a strength of soul, where the mind of the human being always has such a firm hold on itself that no attacks of joy or annoyance can remove its grip” (VA-Menschenkunde 25:1121; cf. VA-Mrongovius 25:1341). Kant recognizes too that some affects serve as a “temporary surrogate of reason,” as when feelings of sympathy motivate us to help, or enthusiasm enlivens a good resolution (A 7:254). Some affects, Kant thinks, are natural mechanisms promoting health: Kant thinks that the weeping of a widow at her husband’s funeral is soothing and restorative; anger (which Kant thinks is sometimes the only emotional exercise some housewives get, as when they scold their children or servants) can sometimes lead to an agreeable tiredness (as long as the children or servants do not counteract the effect by resisting the scolding, and making life even more difficult for the irascible housewife) (A 7:261–2).

5. Fear and courage

Kant's discussion of affects also contains an interesting discussion of fear and responses to it (A 7:256–9; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:805–8). There he draws a number of pertinent distinctions. Kant distinguishes different degrees of fear, ranging from anxiety (*Angst*, *Bangigkeit*) to terror (*Entsetzen*) as regards the degree to which they incapacitate us. He distinguishes courage (*Mut*), which is the composure of mind that enables us to face up to fear, from intrepidity (*Unerschrockenheit*), which is lack of susceptibility to fear (A 7:256); and he defines boldness or daring (*Kühnheit*) as “courage without reflection” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:595). Kant also distinguishes courage, as the ability to stand up to what is fearful, from patience, which is the ability to endure it (A 7:257). He considers courage a *character* trait (a virtue), which may be distinguished from stoutheartedness (*Herzhaftigkeit*) – a quality of *temperament* rather than of character (A 7:256). In the *Groundwork*, however, Kant classifies courage (*Mut*) as a quality of temperament, which is among those “gifts of nature” that are good only when combined with a good will (G 4:393). Properly speaking, though, the moral virtue here is bravery (*Tapferkeit*), or “courage in conformity with law.” “Fearlessness alone is of no consequence; rather, it must be joined with moral irreproachability” (A 7:259).

Kant holds that there is also an affect – a feeling belonging to sensibility, but aroused by reason – that frequently accompanies the successful exercise of the virtue of courage in facing danger and overcoming fear; this affect can also be called “courage” (A 7:257). This might be to some extent at odds with Kant's general account of affects, because Kant tends to consider affects as *obstacles* to rational self-control; but if some affects can be considered surrogates of reason, it may not be inconsistent to hold that some of these might also be *products* of reason (results of the direct influence of reason on sensibility), in the same way Kant thinks about those feelings that are necessary conditions of moral agency (moral feeling, conscience, love of human beings, self-respect) (MS 6:399–405).

Kant also distinguishes courage as the facing down of physical danger from “moral courage”:

If in doing something worthy of honor, we do not allow ourselves to be intimidated by taunts and derisive ridicule of it, which is all the more dangerous when sharpened by wit, but instead pursue our own course steadfastly, we display a moral courage which many who show themselves as brave figures on the battlefield or in a duel do not possess. (A 7:257)

Finally, Kant asks whether the act of suicide can sometimes display courage, especially when by it one avoids disgrace or dishonor. He appears reluctantly to concede that there are such cases, and to admit that “it is not always depraved, worthless souls who decide to rid themselves of the burden of life” (A 7:259); but he never actually retracts his position that suicide is a horrible act, whose morality he cannot defend. Here, as in some passages in his lectures on ethics (VMO-*Collins* 27:370–5; VMO-*Vigilantius* 27:603, 628), Kant displays far more ambivalence and conflict in dealing with this difficult topic than is commonly appreciated.

6. Feelings, values and “emotions”

Kant’s identification of courage as an affect also brings out another striking feature of his taxonomy of desires and affective states: Kant has no single term for what many of his commentators and critics like to call “emotion” (as when the critics mistakenly attack him, usually based on misreadings of G 4:397–9, for being “hostile to the emotions”). What we call “emotions” usually involve both the affective states that Kant calls “feelings” or even “affects,” but also states of desire or even intention. Both fear and courage, for instance, as Kant understands them, include both kinds of state. This parallels Kant’s account of love, which includes practical love – the volition to benefit the beloved – but also love as a feeling, both an empirical feeling (or “pathological love”) and the rational or moral feeling that is one of the “aesthetic pre-concepts” (*ästhetische Vorbegriffe*) without which we could not be motivated to our moral duty (MS 6:399, 401–2; cf. G 4:399). These are feelings which it cannot be our duty to have, but only because they are *presupposed* by acting from duty. (Thus far from being “hostile to emotion,” even as feeling, Kant holds that we could not be motivated to do our duty without it.) Kant associates feelings with desires in this way because for him, feelings are themselves valuational. Pleasure and displeasure (both in human beings and in nonhuman animals) are states involving the furthering or hindering of life processes, while joy and sadness involve comparative judgments on our condition across time, requiring reason (so that Kant denies these last two feelings to nonhuman animals) (A 7:230–1, 254–5; cf. KU 5:187; VA-*Parow* 25:422; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1082). Because Kant holds that feelings involve valuations, and even *rational* valuations, Kant’s claim that pure reason can of itself be practical (KpV 5:31) can be reconciled with his claim that duty can be motivated by respect for the moral law, as well as for other moral feelings (KpV 5:78; G 4:401; MS 6:399–403).²

² See McCarty (1993), 421–35; Guyer (2000), 288–301; De Witt (2014).

7. Passions

Affects often interfere with rational self-government, and we are responsible for what we do under their influence: “The human being is never to be excused on account of this alleged powerlessness or unconsciousness [*Ohnmacht*]” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1124). But Kant considers affects unfortunate rather than evil (A 7:267). They are not the direct enemy of moral virtue; that enemy is *passion* – or at least certain passions, that in Kant’s view form an important part of human *social* psychology.

“Passion” (*Leidenschaft*) is defined as “inclination that can be conquered only with difficulty or not at all by the subject’s reason” (A 7:251). A passion is an inclination that resists rational comparison with other inclinations, or with rational grounds (of instrumental reason, prudence, or morality). Kant therefore characterizes passion as a “mania” or “addiction” (*Sucht*). “Inclination that prevents reason from comparing it with the sum of all inclinations in respect to a certain choice is passion (*passio animi*)” (A 7:265). This resistance, however, is not merely an innocent *absence* of comparison, as might happen with a momentary impulse, or an affect; on the contrary, since inclinations themselves are already habitual desires, involving generalization, comparison, and the choice of maxims, a passion necessarily involves a positive choice, maxim, of *refusing* rational comparison with other inclinations or rational grounds. It is an empirical desire that can never be fully satisfied (A 7:266), because it involves delusion (*Wahn*), or even the inclination to be deluded (A 7:274–5).

A passion is an inclination that represents its object as desirable out of all proportion to its actual worth, and also often as obtainable under circumstances, or in ways, that it plainly is not. The subject of a passion is therefore often willing to run extreme risks, or even engage compulsively in directly counterproductive behavior, in pursuit of the object. An ambitious person, for instance, who seeks honor from others, wants the love and approval of others, and the pleasures of social intercourse with them:

However, if he is a passionately ambitious person, then he is blind to these ends, though his inclinations still summon him to them, and he overlooks completely the risk he is running that he will be hated by others, or avoided in social intercourse, or impoverished through his expenditures. (A 7:266)

Passions can therefore be called “inclinations of delusion, which consists in valuing the mere opinion of others regarding the worth of things as equal to their real worth” (A 7:270). We see here that not only the object, but even the delusion, involved in passions is social in context and content.

8. We are responsible for our passions

Although the term “passion” (*Leidenschaft*) (in German as well as in English and Romance languages) implies passivity, this is more a feature of the way such inclinations are experienced by the subject (who may be involved in self-opacity and self-deception) than a genuine property of them. As we have seen, all inclination, as *habitual* desire, involves a *maxim* freely adopted by the subject. Kant is especially emphatic about this point in the case of passions: “Passion always presupposes a maxim on the part of the subject, to act according to an end prescribed to him by his inclination. Passion is therefore always connected with his reason, and one can no more attribute passion to mere animals than to pure rational beings” (A 7:266). (Passions are *irrational*, and irrationality – the flagrant misuse of reason, or perverse refusal to act in accordance with it – is something of which only rational beings are capable.) Passion, Kant says, is a sickness, but of a peculiar kind: “Passions are cancerous sores for pure practical reason, and for the most part they are incurable because the sick person does not want to be cured and flees from the dominion of principles by which alone a cure could occur” (A 7:266).

Because it “makes part of what is desirable into the whole,” a passion “directly contradicts the formal principle of reason itself. That is why passions are not, like affects, merely unfortunate states of mind full of many ills, but are without exception evil as well. . . . [They are] not merely pragmatically ruinous but also morally reprehensible” (A 7:266–7). Principles of practical reason involve the relation between actions and their objects, hence comparisons between different desires. Instrumental reason bids us do (and hence desire to do) what is necessary to further an end we have set; prudential reason counsels us to compare our inclinations with one another and with our means for satisfying them, and pursue their greatest total satisfaction (our happiness) rather than the satisfaction of momentary impulses or inclinations that might frustrate happiness. Moral reason commands us to set certain ends required by the categorical imperative, and to forego the satisfaction of inclinations that conflict with them. Therefore, when passions refuse all comparisons between desires, they involve a maxim of choosing to satisfy an inclination *rather than* complying with a principle of reason. This is why Kant mentions passions prominently in connection with evil (R 6:30, 93). Kant’s views about the motivated irrationality of evil, and (for that matter) all the paradoxes associated with motivated irrationality (including self-deception, *akrasia*, and lack of self-control), therefore involve the passions.

9. Passions and human sociability

Just as passions are functions (or misfunctions) of our reason, they are also, in Kant's view, functions solely of our *social* condition:

It is not the instigation of nature that arouses what should properly be called the *passions*, which wreak such great devastation in his originally good predisposition. His needs are but limited, and his state of mind in providing for them moderate and tranquil. He is poor (or considers himself so) only to the extent that he is anxious that other human beings will consider him poor and will despise him for it. Envy, addiction to power, avarice, and the malignant inclinations associated with these, assail his nature, which on its own is undemanding, *as soon as he is among human beings*. Nor is it necessary to assume that these are sunk into evil, and are examples that lead him astray: it suffices that they are there, that they surround him, and that they are human beings, and they will mutually corrupt one another's moral disposition and make one another evil. (R 6:93–4, original emphasis)

Non-rational animals, Kant says, are capable of desiring things strongly or violently (for example, sexual union); but these are never *passions*, because animals lack reason, with which passion comes into collision, and therefore they lack the freedom to choose the object contrary to principles of reason. Many things that human beings desire strongly (drinking, gambling, hunting), they are said to desire *passionately*. But Kant does not regard such desires as true passions, because they are really “only so many different states of mere passivity in the faculty of desire, and they deserve to be classified not according to the objects of the faculty of desire as *things* (which are innumerable)” (A 7:269, original emphasis; cf. VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1142), but instead one properly classifies passions

according to the principle of the use or abuse that human beings make of their person and their freedom among one another, when one human being makes another a mere means to this ends. Passions actually are directed only to human beings and can be satisfied only by them. (A 7:269–70; cf. A 7:268; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1141–2; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1359)

10. Natural passions

Kant divides passions, however, into “natural” and “social.” Natural passions, every bit as much as social passions, are directed at other human beings, but they belong to what is “innate,” and not from *culture*, or what is *acquired* (A 7:267). Kant identifies two natural passions: for *freedom* and

for *sex* (A 7:268; cf. VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1359–61), though he also discusses the passion for vengeance under the heading of natural passions (A 7:270–1).

II. The passion for freedom

We saw earlier that Kant regards freedom (external freedom, independence of the will of another) as the most fundamental object of human inclinations. It is also, and for the same reason, the object of the most violent of all human passions. Kant thinks that the cry of the newborn infant is a wail of rage, occasioned by his inability to use his limbs, which it experiences as a kind of external constraint (A 7:268). According to Kant, the brutal savagery of “uncivilized” or pre-agricultural peoples (hunter-gatherers and pastoral nomads) is due to their refusal to submit to the external rule of right, which is a condition for all agriculture and the civilized society based upon it (A 7:269; cf. R 6:32–3):

The savage (who is not habituated to submission) knows no greater misfortune than falling into [the power of another]; and he is right, as long as there is no public law to protect him . . . This accounts for his constant state of warfare, by which he intends to keep others as far away from him as possible. (A 7:268)

In the natural passion for freedom

we see in the complacency with which the victors praise their great deeds (massacring whole peoples, swooping down on them without sparing any, and the like) that what they really value in these deeds is only their own superiority and the destruction they are able to wreak. (R 6:33)

The passion for freedom is thus only the pre-cultural (or “uncivilized”) form taken by the social passion for domination over others: “The human being’s self-will is always ready to break forth into hostility toward his neighbors, and always presses him to claim unconditional freedom, not merely independence of others but even mastery over other beings that are his equals by nature” (A 7:327).

12. Sexual passion

Kant understands sexual passion as the desire to use another person’s body for the gratification of merely animal impulses (A 7:136). Because it is directed not at the whole person, but only at the person’s sex organs, and through the use of this part (without considering the person as a whole), the meaning of sexual desire is to dominate and degrade. “Because sexuality is not an inclination which one human being has for another as such but

is an inclination for the sex of the other, it is a principle of the degradation of humanity . . . a preference for dishonoring [humanity] in order to satisfy an inclination” (VMO-*Collins* 27:385).

Kant allows that sexual desire can be combined with genuine love (though he regards the combination as inherently unstable). He also sees sexual desire, imaginatively transformed and combined in the social condition with the experience of sexual *refusal*, as the psychosocial source of *respect* for personality, of moral feelings generally and of the human capacity to control inclinations through reason (MA 8:113). It is a striking and underappreciated aspect of Kant’s moral psychology that he thinks that *the fundamental moral feeling of respect is rooted in human sexuality*.³ But sexual *passion* is not the source of morality or respect, except in the sense that it is the form of human desire that makes respect necessary, and poses a constant threat to it.

Kant’s views on sexuality, and especially his views on women (his views on the inherent limitations on their intellectual capacities and their properly subordinate role in society), contain much that is nowadays either laughable or morally repugnant to enlightened sensibilities. But this should not be allowed to conceal from us the fact that one of Kant’s main preoccupations in this area is with protecting the woman’s basic right and dignity from assaults (economic and social as well as direct and violent) that are made possible by the physical and social superiority that men have over women. There is nothing outdated or unenlightened about that concern.

13. Social passions

In the *Groundwork*, Kant lists among the “gifts of fortune” the trio of power, wealth, and honor (G 4:393). We probably do not appreciate that here he is also giving us, in outline, and by way of their respective objects, his theory of the social passions: *tyranny* (or the addiction to domination, *Herrschaftsucht*), *greed* (the addiction to possessing, *Habsucht*) and *ambition* (the addiction to honor, *Ehrensucht*). The same trio lies behind Kant’s earlier threefold division of “resources” (as formal objects of inclination): “Resources are threefold: talent, power, and money; on this are grounded the three inclinations: ambition, tyranny, and greed. These are the three passions, which pertain to the three resources through which we seek to satisfy all our inclinations” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1141). But the general aim of the social passions consists of a pair of related objects: “obtaining rank or status among [our] fellow human beings” (Idea 8:21) and “getting other people’s inclinations

³ For further discussion, see Wood (2008).

into one's power, so that one can direct and determine them according to one's intentions, [which is] almost the same as possessing others as mere tools of one's will" (A 7:271).

Through the social passions, we seek superiority or control over others in specific ways: in tyranny, through their fear; in greed, through their interest; in ambition, through their opinion (A 7:272). Recall too that in a passage quoted above from the *Religion*, Kant attributed to our social condition the evil inclinations "envy, addiction to power, avarice" – the very same trio, once we realize that "avarice" is another term for greed, and that envy is only the vicious side of failed ambition. In this trio of social passions, the predisposition to humanity (the capacity to set ends according to reason), in its development by human beings themselves through freedom, turns into what Kant elsewhere calls "unsociable sociability" (Idea 8:20–1) or the "self-conceit" which needs to be "struck down" or "humiliated" through respect for the moral law (KpV 5:73). Here it becomes quite clear why Kant thinks of the passions, especially the social passions, as lying close to the source of the radical evil in human nature.

Passions involve not only moral evil, but also imprudence, and they are frequently irrational in the direct sense that they are counterproductive to the very end they propose. More specifically, if every passion involves the end of attaining superiority and control of another, passions also – by the irrationality and delusion involved in them – make us, on the contrary, inferior to those who know how to make use of our passions against us, hence vulnerable to the domination and control of others. Every passion involves "a slavish disposition, through which another, having gained power over it, acquires the capacity to use one's own inclinations to serve his aims" (A 7:272).⁴ The greedy are the most easily swindled; those who seek power are often the most slavish followers of those they think can give it to them; and those who most passionately seek the admiration of others tend to be the most fawning admirers. "Here the human being becomes the dupe of his own inclinations, and in his use of such means he misses his final end" (A 7:271).

14. Kant's judgment on the passions

Kant considers, but roundly rejects, the saying (later taken up with approval by both Hegel and Emerson) that "nothing great in the world has ever

⁴ "One believes himself the others' master, yet is more a slave than they" (Rousseau (1997), Book 1, Chapter 1, 41).

been accomplished without intense passions, and that Providence itself has wisely implanted passions in human nature, just like elastic springs.”⁵ No doubt some eulogies of the passions use the word “passion” in a broader (or even an entirely different) sense from Kant’s. But Kant’s rejection of this and other expressions of praise for the passions acknowledges no use of the word in which it might refer to something favorable. “The philosopher,” he says, “must not accept this principle, not even to praise the passions as a provisional arrangement of Providence” (A 7:267).

Kant’s virtually unqualified condemnation of the passions in his mature writings contrasts somewhat, however, with his treatment of them in *Anthropologie Friedländer* (1775–6). Instead of treating passions as distinctively human and involving a self-imposed and voluntary refusal of rationality, that discussion considers both passions and affects as originally functions of our animality (VA-Friedländer 25:616–17). In response to the question whether affects and passions are good, or always to be subdued, he replies that passions may be considered good as part of the order of nature, but cannot be approved from the standpoint of the rule of reason (VA-Friedländer 25:617).

Kant’s discussion here, both in its naturalistic starting point and in some of its observations, reflects the possible influence of Shaftesbury’s qualified praise of the passions in Book II, Part I, Section III of *An Inquiry Concerning Virtue or Merit* (1711) (Shaftesbury (1964), Volume 1, 285–317). Kant appears even to consider it possible for passions to be praiseworthy, and to arise from reflection or even from principles:

⁵ Kant’s source for this quotation has not been identified. The closest antecedent I have been able to find among works with which Kant would have been familiar is the following from Shaftesbury: “Something there will be of extravagance and fury, when the ideas or images received are too big for the narrow human vessel to contain. So that inspiration may be justly called divine enthusiasm; for the word itself signifies divine presence, and was made use of by the philosopher whom the earliest Christian Fathers called divine [sc. Plato], to express whatever was sublime in human passions. This was the spirit he allotted to heroes, statesmen, poets, orators, musicians, and even philosophers themselves. Nor can we, of our own accord, forbear ascribing to a noble enthusiasm whatever is greatly performed by any of these” (Shaftesbury (1964), Volume 1, 38–9). Hegel holds that world-historical transitions are effected by men driven by passion in precisely Kant’s sense: a mania or obsession focused narrowly on a determinate goal, which respects neither morality nor prudence. He thinks this kind of motivation is necessary if world-historical individuals such as Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, or Napoleon Bonaparte are to overturn one world order or system of ethical life and usher a new one into being. The world-historical justification that Hegel insists their actions possess does not prevent Hegel from agreeing with Kant’s views on passion by depicting world-historical individuals neither as morally virtuous nor as achieving happiness (since they die early, like Alexander; are murdered, like Caesar; or are transported to St. Helena, like Napoleon). See Hegel (1975), 73. In Emerson’s version, the saying is, “Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm” (Emerson (2000), 262).

There exist some passions, which for that reason, because they are passions, are good-natured, and thus have a greater degree of worth as passions, than if they were only inclinations. [They] arise from reflection or from principles, and the action which arises from the passion, thereby receives a worth. (VA-Friedländer 25:613)

Kant's only examples, however, are drawn not from the natural or social passions discussed above, but only from cases of the passion of love – which even later Kant considers a passion, though only as long as it remains unrequited (A 7:266). In *Anthropologie Friedländer*, however, Kant says that in some cases love is considered *better* when it is passionate than when it arises from deliberation or duty; he instances here the love of a husband for his wife, and the love of parents for their children (VA-Friedländer 25:613–15).

This might even be seen as a kind of agreement with Bernard Williams, when he accuses moralists (including Kant) of entertaining “one thought too many” in endorsing morally reflective reasons for acting out of love, when we might think it more natural and more admirable to act spontaneously and from passion (Williams (1981), “Persons, Character, Morality”). But Kant's further discussion of the husband's love makes one shrewd and salient point found also in Kant's later treatment of passion, namely that the wife's desire to be loved passionately (rather than from mere inclination, much less from duty or rational reflection) by no means arises from her love for him, but rather from her desire – by no means innocent – to be superior, to exercise power and control:

Thus, for example, a woman does not like to see it, when she is loved by her husband only from duty, from mature deliberation. True, it is agreeable for her that he cares for her as her husband, and gives evidence of genuine benevolence toward her; however, she still considers herself less fortunate, if her husband loves her due to reflection and not due to passion, so that he cannot live without her. The reason is this: passion is a means of ruling the other. Who has passion can be ruled by means of it by the one toward whom it is directed, and therefore, if the man loves her due to passion, the woman has power over him. But if the man loves solely due to inclination, so that he is not in love, then he is that much less [subject] to being ruled by his wife, for thereby, that he becomes weak, his wife becomes strong. (VA-Friedländer 25:613)

This is a thoroughly Kantian thought, and entirely consistent with his later condemnation of the passions. It is also *one thought too many* for Williams's arguments: that is, it is a thought whose implications would discredit them.

Kant as “vitalist”: the “principium of life” in Anthropologie Friedländer

Susan Meld Shell

1. Background

Kant’s so-called “silent decade,” the period extending roughly from 1771 to 1781, represents one of the persistent mysteries of his intellectual development. During this period, in which he was also hard at work on his long-promised “critique of reason,” Kant produced only a few brief essays and reviews (on human anatomy, race, and Basedow’s *Philanthropin*).¹ Kant’s *Lectures on Anthropology* opens a welcome window on these years. Of these lecture series, *Anthropologie Friedländer* (1775–6) is especially important, both for its relative completeness, and for its date, midway through the decade, after three years of almost total public silence on Kant’s part. Indeed, *Friedländer*, along with the roughly contemporaneous *Philosophic Encyclopedia Lectures*, and *Kaehler Lectures on Ethics*, represents our only extended written evidence concerning Kant’s thinking during this crucial period.

Friedländer captures Kant at a high-water mark in his confidence in “pragmatic anthropology” as a means of discovering and promoting the twofold “determination” (*Bestimmung*) of man. A 1773 letter to Marcus Hertz, in which Kant apologizes for the delayed appearance of a work of transcendental philosophy that he had announced as forthcoming in a letter of the previous year, provides a useful introduction to Kant’s then understanding of the relation of anthropology to his overall critical project. A “critique of pure reason,” as he here calls it, will (he hopes) not only “for the first time give philosophy an enduring way [*daurerhafte Art*] but also give a favorable turn to both morality and religion” (C 10:144). After cautioning Hertz against forgetting that the “highest ground” of moral philosophy cannot be a “mere speculative representation” but must have

¹ The *Anthropologie Friedländer* ends with a striking encomium to the *Philanthropin*, described as “the greatest phenomenon for the improvement of humanity to appear in this century” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:722–3; my translation). (All translations from the *Lectures on Anthropology* are my own.)

“moving force” (*Bewegkraft*), and after commending his friend’s recent review of Platner’s *Anthropologie*, Kant adds:

This winter, for the second time, I am giving a lecture course on anthropology, which I now intend to make into a proper academic discipline. But my plan [*Plan*] is quite unique. The intention that I have is to disclose through it the sources of all the sciences, that of morals, of skill, of social intercourse, of the method of forming [*bilden*] and governing [*regieren*] human beings, and thus of everything [pertaining to] the practical . . . I include so many observations of common life [*gemeinen Leben*] that my listeners have constant occasion to compare their ordinary experience with my remarks and thus, from beginning to end, find the lectures entertaining and never dry. In my spare time, I am working on a preparatory exercise for academic youth out of this (in my view) very pleasant observational doctrine [*Beobachtungslehre*] of skill [*Geschicklichkeit*], prudence [*Klugheit*], and even wisdom [*Weisheit*] that, along with physical geography, is distinct from all other instruction and can be called knowledge of the world. (C 10:145–6)

The originality of Kant’s plan lies as much in its appeal to “pleasure” as in its bracing intellectual ambition: nothing less than disclosure of “the sources of all the sciences” with a view to everything pertaining to the “practical,” be it skill, prudence or (even) wisdom; and it serves as a gentle reminder to his eager friend and former student that, as Kant earlier puts it, “although the highest ground of morality is intellectual, it must also have an exact relation to the primary incentives of the will” (C 10:145).

The *Friedländer* transcript, based on the course that Kant delivered two years later, fulfills that ambition to a remarkable degree; read in the order in which Kant delivered it, the lectures attempt both a comprehensive account of “all human relations” (as he puts it) and a partial answer to the question, pressing both philosophically and pedagogically, that Kant’s letter had left hanging, namely how moral ideas – concepts, that is, whose source is purely intellectual – can have “moving force” in the world in which we actually live. Kant’s tentative answer hinges, as we shall see, on the relation between a lower “principle of life,” and a higher principle of “activity” or (lawful) “freedom.” Human ills arise from the discrepancy between two accompanying “determinations” – one toward our animal survival, the other toward the development of reason. Their reconciliation is impeded, in modern times, by the opposing intellectual vices of “enthusiasm” on the one hand and “pedantry” (*Pedanterie*) on the other, culminating in a peculiar sort of rational self-loathing or “misology.” As we shall see, pragmatic anthropology helps to counter that spiritual life-threat with a history of the human race that makes reason’s true “end,” which is practical and moral rather than speculative, newly self-transparent.

So conceived, “pragmatic anthropology” not only allows Kant to provisionally address the “precise relation” between the “highest ground of morality” and the “the primary incentives of the will” (as he puts it in his letter to Hertz); it also reflects Kant’s lingering reliance on “inner sense” to supply our primary “knowledge of the soul.” He is not yet able to clarify, to his own satisfaction, the distinction between “psychology,” on the one hand, and “critical” knowledge of the necessary formal conditions that make empirical self-consciousness possible, on the other. Kant’s “true idealism,” at this point, is “rational and moral”² but not yet “transcendental.”³

Kant’s brief essay on race (initially attached to the announcement of his 1775 course on physical geography, and republished, with minor modifications, in 1777) sheds additional light on his general understanding during this period of man’s twofold *Bestimmung*. In that essay, Kant traces the regularly inherited differences between the various human races to the stimulation of a variety of “predispositions,” each inherent in an original human “germ,” that allowed early humans to adapt to a wide variety of climates across the planet, thereby fostering our physical survival in an environment subject to local catastrophe. A second predisposition, toward the development of reason, unfolds differentially among the various races, and emerges fully, as Kant here suggests, only among Europeans.

This two-stage model of human development had also marked the only other work Kant published during the decade of the 1770s: a short review of Moscati’s *Anatomy* that traced a number of human ailments, including some from which Kant personally suffered, to the structural indeterminacy of a body designed both for four-footed animal survival and for two-footed rational discourse.⁴ Pragmatic anthropology as Kant conceives it in the mid 1770s permits us to anticipate historically (as we shall see) the union of our animal and rational determinations, and thereby produce a realizable idea of “humanity” as such.

2. “Pragmatic anthropology”

The announced subject of *Friedländer* is “knowledge of the world” (*Kenntnis der Welt*) of a sort that Kant for the first time calls “pragmatic,” a term absent from the earlier Collins/Parow transcripts (from the early 1770s).

² On Kant’s earlier “moral turn,” see Velkley (1989); and Shell and Velkley (2013), 3–14.

³ Cf. the “Philosophic Encyclopedia” lectures (PhilEnz 29:11, 23); for a general discussion of Kant’s treatment of rational and empirical psychology during this period, see Dyck (2009).

⁴ For a fuller treatment, see Shell (1996), 273–5; on man’s twofold determination, see also Munzel (1999), 337–45.

Pragmatic anthropology is neither “theoretical” nor “empirical” knowledge (though it draws upon each) but instead specifically directed toward what is “useful” to human beings (VA-Friedländer 25:469). Knowledge of the world that remains only theoretical is defective in a crucial sense, namely its failure to be of use (*Gebrauch*), which requires judgment (*Urtheilskraft*) of a special kind (here identified as “prudence”). To be sure, even scholarly learnedness requires prudence of a kind; still, unless supplemented and completed by knowledge of the world, it is merely “pedantry,” a topic to which Kant will soon return.

By “world” Kant here means “the sum total [*Inbegriff*] of relations into which human beings can enter” insofar as they involve both “nature” and “the human being.” The two branches of worldly knowledge are physical geography and pragmatic anthropology. Physical geography is concerned with our objective situation: the totality of man’s relations with the physical environment (or “outer sense”). Pragmatic anthropology is concerned, additionally, with our subjective situation: the totality of human opinions, desires, and attitudes (or “inner sense”). Even more than physical geography, pragmatic anthropology *interests* us (VA-Friedländer 25:470). Geographic knowledge of the world is merely local and contingent. Anthropology, by way of contrast, is based on an “idea” (that all previous anthropological inquiries have lacked) – one involving “general knowledge” of the “nature of humanity,” with a view to “prudent use in life” (VA-Friedländer 25:471–2).

Gaining such universal knowledge, however, is no easy matter, and may ultimately require a “world history” or “history of humanity [*Menschheit*],” (as opposed to a mere history of human vicissitudes) that “has yet to be written” (VA-Friedländer 25:472). Still, Kant takes an initial clue from what he here calls our *Selbstheit* (VA-Friedländer 25:473). Knowledge of the human being is at the same time “my knowledge.” Hence, “there must lie at its basis [*zum Grund . . . liegen*]” a “natural knowledge” that allows us to judge “what lies at the basis of every human being” (VA-Friedländer 25:471). The integral relation between self-knowledge and knowledge of human nature as such makes possible the transformation of what would otherwise be a mere aggregate of maxims into “science” in the genuine sense (VA-Friedländer 25:471–2).

3. “Empirical psychology”

Part One, which is explicitly devoted to empirical psychology (VA-Friedländer 25:558), deals with the three “sources” of the mind’s

“phenomena,” namely (1) cognition, (2) pleasure and displeasure, and (3) desire.⁵

3.1. Cognition

Kant’s treatment of cognition begins with knowledge of our “selfhood” (*Selbstheit*), a term that does not appear in other versions of the lectures or elsewhere in his extant writings. By “selfhood” (*Selbstheit*) he here has in mind, he says, the basic sense of personhood or individuality,⁶ inherent in self-consciousness, that distinguishes the human being from all other living beings on earth. Self-consciousness makes each of us a worldly focal point that is both unique and irreducible to any other. This *Selbstheit* becomes selfishness or egoism only when one no longer regards oneself as one worldly focus among myriad others, as Kant puts it, but as the world’s sole “center” (VA-Friedländer 25:476).⁷

Kant bases a “pragmatic” knowledge of the self not on rational psychology, but on what is (empirically) contained in the self-intuition involved when the term “I” is used in ordinary life – i.e. on a rough anticipation of what he will later call the “existential” self (KrV B 422n). Accordingly, he here draws the characteristics of substantiality and simplicity from how we use the word “I” grammatically, in common speech. And he draws the characteristic of “spontaneity” from the similarly speech-related fact that “when I say: I act [*thue*], I am not moved [*so werde ich nicht bewegt*]” (VA-Friedländer 25:473).

Kant here leaves unsettled whether or not in saying “I act” I *truly* am not moved by some foreign power or merely so regard myself. He leaves unsettled, that is to say, whether by making use in this way of the concept “I” we prove that we are free in a transcendental sense, as distinguished from a merely “practical” sense, as he will later put it in the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. But in either case, by virtue of this power to acknowledge action as our own, we express both spirit (*Geist*) and *Gemüth*,⁸

⁵ While all three terms appear in Baumgarten’s text (on which Kant’s lectures are officially based), pleasure (and pain) is not there discussed as a separate “faculty,” a treatment Kant may have partly derived from Mendelssohn.

⁶ See also “Die Seele ist das eigentliche Ich” (VA-Friedländer 25:473). The term *Selbstheit* (which, in its original use by mystics such as Meister Eckhart and Jakob Boehme, had a negative connotation) subsequently drops from Kant’s vocabulary.

⁷ Rousseau’s “Savoyard Vicar” makes a similar claim; see Rousseau (1969), 602.

⁸ *Gemüth* resists ready translation into English. Each of the two most obvious choices – “heart” and “mind” – has significant drawbacks. “Heart” seems better as a translation of *Herz*, which Kant later defines as the sum total of the “forces of desire” as distinguished from those of “cognition” (for which he uses the term “head” – *Kopf*) (VA-Friedländer 25:554). And “mind” suggests intellectual

and thereby demonstrably transcend the merely passive capacity (*Fähigkeit*) to be determined “inwardly” by forces external to ourselves – a capacity we share with animals (who, like us, possess a soul (*anima*)).⁹

Gemüth is the term that Kant here generally employs when speaking of the “self” as an object of empirical self-consciousness.¹⁰ *Gemüth*, he says, is the “way” (*Art*) in which the soul is affected by things, and involves an ability (*Vermögen*) to reflect (*reflectieren*) upon one’s state and to relate it to oneself and one’s personality, to “feel,” as he also puts it, “*what* one feels” (emphasis added). At the same time, whereas *Geist*, or the “thinking subject,” is active, *Gemüth* is (relatively) passive, a “good *Gemüth*,” connoting, for example, facility in learning things (from others). As with the English “mood” (with which it bears some etymological relation), *Gemüth* is where the soul feels happiness or misery expressive of our condition as a “whole,” as distinguished from isolated pains and pleasures that affect the soul (*anima*) alone (VA-Friedländer 25:474).

Gemüth, in short, is irreducible to *anima* (which we share with animals) and yet distinct, in its (relative) passivity, from “intellect” or *Geist*. The ancients, whose ideal of self-control is partially Kant’s model here, as he notes, have no strict verbal equivalent: *animus* (the closest Latin term) is also synonymous with *mens* (generally translated by Kant as *Geist*), which includes an intellectual element that *Gemüth*, whose perfection lies in being *mastered* by the intellect, specifically excludes.

It is by virtue of *Gemüth*, which constitutes, as it were, the self as (passive) “object” to itself, that man is both capable of and subject to “self-control,” and thus regards himself as “twofold, namely as animal and as intelligence [*Intelligenz*]” (VA-Friedländer 25:474). As animal, we are capable of feelings, impressions, and representations; as intelligence we are conscious of

qualities involved in “mastering” the *Gemüth*. These qualities are instead associated with *Kopf*, whose proportional arrangements, as we later learn, are as peculiar to each individual as one’s “face,” with which, indeed, it bears a pragmatically discernible relation (the subject of “physiognomy”) (VA-Friedländer 25:627, 663).

⁹ On Kant’s relation to “vitalists” like Stahl during this period, see Huneman (2008), 21–84. On

Kant’s general understanding of organic life at this time, see Zammito (2006); and Mensch (2013).
¹⁰ Kant also compares *Gemüth* to an optical box (*optisch Kast*) or magic lantern. Like the latter, *Gemüth* is the seat of images (such as that of the future) that lack reality, as in involuntary dreaming or voluntary prognostication (cf. VA-Friedländer 25:481, 25:501); see also Munzel’s helpful editorial note in the Cambridge translation of the *Lectures on Anthropology* (528n7). *Gemüth*, in these lecture notes, is the site or faculty through which the self is aware of how it is affected “as a whole,” including how it is affected by its own active powers. *Gemüth* is a faculty of “reflection” in the sense of “reflecting back” a primordial life activity (both voluntary and involuntary), and thus rendering it inwardly observable (VA-Friedländer 25:424). As such, *Gemüth* is a quintessentially human faculty, mediating between the soul, which “animates” the body, and “spirit” or “personality,” which may, or may not, persist without it.

ourselves, and have power (*Macht*), as spirit (*Geist*), over our condition and our animality. A kitten placed on a high shelf may well feel fear; but it will not experience vertigo, which involves an irrational succumbing to fear that it is in one’s power to counteract through understanding, and thus illustrates that sort of thing, “belonging to *Gemüth*,” that a wise man, as Kant puts it, should “keep distant” (VA-Friedländer 25:475; cf. 593).

The ability to gain mastery over one’s *Gemüth* also involves the possibility of failure, accompanied by a “self-reproof” reflective of the “natural conflict” endemic to a “combined personality” like ours – one that is both “dependent” (by virtue of its animality) and “masterful” (by virtue of its spirit (*Geist*) or intelligence (*Intelligenz*)). The main task of “personality” is to “lead soul and body into harmony [*Harmonie*]” – both through “compulsion,” and through “self-mastery via rules and discipline” (VA-Friedländer 25:476).

The domination of sensibility by the understanding, however, has its limits. Without the senses, understanding lacks the power to “execute” its rule (VA-Friedländer 25:486–7). The senses, as Kant puts it, are an “incentive of the will [*Will*], but understanding has no incentive.” But this only moves the problem back a step: “one does not see at all” how understanding, “which lacks moving force [*bewegende Kraft*],” can “affect the senses.”

Still, that ability is evinced in such ordinary cognitive acts as deliberately paying attention to, or abstracting one’s attention from, whatever immediately “affects one” (cf. Rousseau (1969), 573). This freedom to regard or disregard aspects of our passive condition engages what Kant here calls the “two formal forces” of the *Gemüth*, absent which “all other [mental] provision” would be “useless.” The greater one’s control over these two forces, the greater the “perfection” of the *Gemüth* more generally, ultimately permitting us to “put our fate in our own hands” by “ignoring ills that can’t be changed” and concentrating on “the pleasant things” (VA-Friedländer 25:489).

At the same time, the propensity (*Hang*) of *Gemüth* “to complete everything and make a certain whole” – a propensity on which awareness of ourselves as objects of inner sense depends – makes attending easier than abstracting, which requires “real effort.” Once imagination has presented in advance “someone’s entire shape [*Gestalt*],” our attention tends to fixate involuntarily on whatever is accidentally missing from the whole. Owing to that propensity, one must often work to overcome fixations that prevent one from estimating things at their “true value” (as with young men who fix upon a worthy woman’s minor physical deficiencies and thus

deny themselves what might have been an “enduring happiness”) (VA-Friedländer 25:490).

On the other hand, this same propensity (to form a whole) also gives rise – in ways Kant is not yet able, as it seems, to specify precisely – to both concept formation and the generation of ideas:

The faculty of forming [*das Vermögen zu bilden*] has a propensity to complete the formation [*auszubilden*] of everything in our *Gemüth*. When we become aware of something, we make a concept of it for ourselves. If the object doesn't harmonize with our concept, then the *Gemüth* persistently endeavors to complete it. (VA-Friedländer 25:512)

This *facultas perficiendi* is “natural,” and “very good for us,” leading us “to supply what is missing” – e.g., in the case of (the figure of) Socrates, to fill in the few shortcomings of his actual life to form a “complete wise man.” And it also gives rise to what Kant here calls the “true idealism,” which consists not in fixating upon inner sense, or what is idiosyncratic to oneself (as with metaphysical and aesthetic idealists, respectively), but instead in placing little value in external things:

He who fixes upon [*statuirt*] no object of outer sense is an idealist . . . We can . . . represent a rational idealism, which consists in this: that our happiness [*Glück*] does not depend on external things, but that things have the value that we give them . . . Happiness doesn't consist in things but in the way [*Art*] in which the *Gemüth* accepts it. *Gemüth* can do much in this regard: it can re-form [*umformen*] the whole world for itself. The emptiness of things and the brevity of life gives occasion for this . . . *Gemüth* can thus easily have insight [*einsehe*] that true happiness rests on the idea, and this is the true idealism, which is rational and practical. (VA-Friedländer 25:492–3)

But these world-constituting powers of the imagination (*Phantasie*) are ambiguous in their effects (VA-Friedländer 25:511). On the one hand, they support the “insight” that “true happiness rests on the idea” and thereby put fortune within our power.¹¹

On the other hand, the mind's formative powers also expose us to the danger of “enthusiasm,” i.e. “of taking the ideal for something real.” This danger is heightened when those powers take the form of “composition”

¹¹ They also seem to play a crucial role in the formation of concepts, at this stage of Kant's thinking, through what he calls the “three elements” of rule-governed “association” – namely time and space (which pertain to sensibility) and affinity (*Verwandschaft*) (which pertains to understanding) (VA-Friedländer 25:513). What he here calls “affinity” will later become the category of relation (*Relation*), “affinity” being reserved, according to his later “epigenetic” model, to the peculiar “kinship” that links sensibility and understanding. On the latter, see Zöller (1988); Waxman (1991); 250–63; and Mensch (2013), 125–45. Cf. A 7:176–7.

(*Dichtung*), which (unlike *Phantasie*, which runs on willy-nilly) involves an “active, voluntary power” to produce “new representations.”

The forms of enthusiasm with which *Friedländer* especially concerns itself are cases of idealism gone awry, as with disillusioned lovers, whose undue demand for feminine perfection leads them to become misogynists, or with Rousseau, whose enthusiasm for humanity similarly culminated in misanthropy (VA-*Friedländer* 25:530). So, too, thoughtful individuals may become enemies of reason out of disappointment with its inability to satisfy their longing to know their future *Bestimmung*:

Misology is a property of reflective [*nachdenkender*] people, who undertake investigations into their future vocation [*Bestimmung*] and chief ends, investigations that culminate in this, that the human being has insight into his ignorance [*Unwissenheit*]. Now if reason cannot do enough with regard to knowledge [*Wissen*], if it cannot satisfy one in this . . . so that the human being cannot look toward the goal and end of all things [*das Ziel und Ende aller Dinge*]¹² *nicht absieht*, the human being betakes himself to simple-mindedness and renounces reason entirely, in the same way that someone becomes a misanthrope through the feeling of virtue – not because he hates human beings, but because he doesn’t find them as he wishes them to be . . . [Accordingly] one does not become a misologist out of hatred of reason; indeed one esteems it, but because it gives poor service. One who has become accustomed to using reason [*die Vernunft zubrauchen*], one who has a propensity [*Hang*] thereto . . . thinks for the entire remainder of his life . . . Misogyny, or hatred of women, occurs in the same way. It also arises from an ill humor [*Laune*], not because one despises them, but because one does not find in them what one believes, thus from entirely too great a demand for their perfections. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:553)

Misology (*Misologie*) arises from human reason’s seeming “futility,” its arousal of a demand (to know “the end of all things”) that it can meet only negatively, with knowledge of our ignorance (VA-*Friedländer* 25:553).¹³ Pragmatic anthropology supplements that ignorance, as we shall see, by offering a “plan” for realizing the end of things “historically”; that is to say, through “politics and education.”

3.2. *Pleasure and displeasure*

To recognize something as good or bad does not suffice to make one like it or dislike it, on Kant’s account; for this one also needs a faculty for feeling

¹² Cf. Kant’s later essay entitled *The End of All Things* [1794] (ED 8:325–40).

¹³ The *locus classicus* of this argument is Plato’s *Phaedo* 89 d–e, which specifically concerns human uncertainty about the status of the soul after death. (Plato mentions “misanthropy” in this context but not “misogyny,” which would seem to be Kant’s own addition.) Cf. G 4:395.

pleasure and pain, which registers the effect things have on the “whole of the *Gemüth*” (VA-Friedländer 25:559). Pleasure is the feeling “of the promotion of life,” pain the feeling of its “hindrance.” (Life, for its part, is “consciousness of a free and regular play of all the forces and faculties of the human being.”) This pleasure takes three forms: sensual (which arises from an elevation of organic functioning), aesthetic or “ideal” (which reflects the free play of the powers of the mind), and “intellectual” or moral (which consists in “consciousness of the use of freedom in accordance with rules”). Despite the different kinds of goods they indicate, these various pleasures make up a single “determinate sum” that constitutes a “feeling” for one’s “life” or wellbeing “as a whole”:

Although our enjoyments are not uniform in accordance with the objects, they can still be added together later, since they then constitute the whole of well-being, just as if they were uniform. Although these enjoyments are very different, and one is an ideal one, the other a sensual one, we still thus put them together on an equal footing and take them in one sum. The reason is: all delights relate to life. But life is a unity, and to the extent they are all directed at this, they are all uniform. (VA-Friedländer 25:560–1)

The “unity” of life makes sensual, ideal, and intellectual pleasure mutually commensurable (at this stage of Kant’s thinking). “Freedom” is the “greatest life” (*grösste Leben*) of the human being, and is sensed as a maximum continuous with vital feeling generally, rather than by the moral feeling of “respect” – a feeling discontinuous with sensual pleasure (as in Kant’s later moral writings, beginning with the *Groundwork* (G 4:401n)). This commensurability renders different states of mind mutually comparable: organic dysfunction can render that state so painful as to make death seem preferable to ongoing survival (VA-Friedländer 25:561) (though, as he later also insists, only moral self-reproach can make life truly not worth living (VA-Friedländer 25:597)).

Through “deliberation” over time, or “practice,” one can achieve a state of “equanimity” (*Gleichmütigkeit*) that makes possible real happiness. Such equanimity, Kant says:

is properly the self-feeling of a healthy soul, just as the self-feeling of a healthy body is complete health. One feels in oneself the source [*Quell*] of life. Health of soul and body is certainly the greatest happiness [*Glück*]; it is the greatest sum of pleasure and enjoyment [inasmuch as] the ground thereof lies in the human being himself. (VA-Friedländer 25:561–2)

“Equanimity,” in short, is an imperturbable awareness of well-being:

Indifference due to insensitivity is stupidity, but equanimity is an effect of strength and not of weakness; it consists in the possession of well-being irrespective of the condition of external objects, and in the consciousness of the mass [*Größe*] of well-being that outweighs all external circumstances. Equanimity befits philosophers. (VA-Friedländer 25:561)

“Well-being,” Kant concludes, “must thus be a determinate sum [*bestimmte Summe*] that one feels in oneself.” This “constant enjoyment in oneself,” in which true happiness consists, also depends upon the body, making mastery over one’s “temperament,” or “the condition in which the human being judges things in the world according to his disposition” (VA-Friedländer 25:563), especially important, with particular emphasis on disgust (*Eckel*) (here described as a feeling that makes life “hateful” to itself (VA-Friedländer 25:566)).¹⁴ The “composed man” (*gesetzten Mann*) rationally estimates pains and pleasures at their proper worth relative to that total sum (VA-Friedländer 25:571), both by keeping his *Gemüth* “distant” in cases touching upon moral right and wrong (VA-Friedländer 25:475), and by not letting trivial pains and pleasures “enter his *Gemüth*” at all.

3.3. *Desire*

The “force of a thinking being” to “determine itself to action” is “something subtle,” that “cannot be explained precisely” (VA-Friedländer 25:577). Still, it can be understood for (present) anthropological purposes, Kant says, as that which serves “in the thinking self” as “motive force in the corporeal world.” Desires are either “driving” (*treibende*) or “idle” (*müßig*). Driving desires accomplish in living beings what impact (*Stoß*) does to lifeless beings. Thus “choleric” persons, as Kant here informs us, are more prone to driving desires, while “phlegmatic” individuals are more prone to idle ones (VA-Friedländer 25:577). The more “sources of activity” an individual is “sensible of in himself,” the more his desires are “driving” (or directed toward determining him to “action”) rather than “idle” (or directed only toward an “idea,” without any accompanying effort toward its realization). Driving desires “realize the sources of life” in purposive activity, while idle ones exhaust them both “uselessly” or, *in extremis*, in a manner contrary to their consciously intended purpose (in which case they are called “passions”).

One can “satisfy” desire in one of two ways: either by possessing what one desires (as with “simple” human beings), or by having everything that

¹⁴ Translating *Eckel* as “disgust,” which retains the hint of physicality that Kant here means to stress; cf. A 7:250.

one regards as needful (as with the wise). The former is called “natural sufficiency [*Genugsamkeit*],” the latter “acquired satisfaction” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:578; cf. Bem 20:2). Rational desires, which “especially refer to the moral,” are those that the “good-natured” desire to have, and that even scoundrels would choose “if it cost them nothing.” Such desires, which put desire in general “in agreement with itself,” seem to depend “on each person’s will,” though “to have such a will” is “difficult” – not least, owing to many people’s “passionate” confusion of ends and means – be it wealth (in the case of “misers”) or reputation (in the case of “honor-seekers”) (VA-*Friedländer* 25:587–8).

At what end, or ends, then, does reason properly aim? In part, at maintaining that composure, or peace of mind (*Gemüth*), that permits us to estimate objects at their true value, rather than succumbing to individual passions and affects that make the part seem larger than the whole (VA-*Friedländer* 25:591) – e.g. when a young man is unable to properly assess a prospective bride because he is overly affected by her physical charms (or defects) (VA-*Friedländer* 25:590). Indeed, the noblest movements of the *Gemüth* may in this respect be the most harmful, for it is here (where the object is not merely sensual) that one especially needs “the guidance of reason.” By the same token, even if an affect or passion “is directed to something good,” i.e. is in accordance with the purposes of nature, it is still not completely vindicated, for the good must also be “cognized . . . through the understanding,” or, as Kant also puts it here, “according to the form” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:591).

As for the manner of maintaining such composure: we should take physical ills “to heart” – i.e. permit their entrance into the “totality” of our desires – without “drawing them in” to the *Gemüth* – i.e. consciously attend to them. In the moral sphere, by way of contrast, we must indeed “draw everything into the *Gemüth*” – i.e. “esteem ourselves unhappy only if we are unworthy of it,” for no merely external ill can make us so unhappy that we are no longer worthy of living. Accordingly, we should show courage (*Muth*) in the face of even the greatest ills, as we then at least deserve respect (*Achtung*) rather than “degrading humanity” through lack of fortitude (VA-*Friedländer* 25:597).

Are happiness and worthiness to be happy, then, continuous and homogeneous (as Kant’s treatment of [moral] freedom as “the greatest life” suggests) or are they discontinuous and heterogeneous (as in Kant’s later moral works, such as the *Groundwork*)? On this crucial point, *Friedländer* seems to want it both ways: on the one hand, the “objects” of sensible and spiritual pleasure are “different in kind”; on the other hand, they make up

a single "determinate sum" of "pleasure" that constitutes a "feeling for our life as a whole" (cf. KpV 5:161–2, 86, 89). A similar ambivalence surrounds Kant's treatment of "disgust" (*Eckel*), one of three sorts of "revulsion," whose other forms include "hatred" and "contempt." Of the three, disgust has the peculiarity of "having no equivalent"; unlike other painful feelings, disgust "inhibits the source of life" itself, and hence is inimical to the sort of ideal pleasure to which other painful feelings lend themselves (as in the case of tragedy). Unlike other painful feelings, in other words, which can contribute indirectly to an "enlivened" state of mind, disgust entails "revulsion for the object," that is to say, revulsion "in and for itself" or "simply" (*schlechterdings*):

Motions of the *Gemüth* due to disgust suppress all enjoyment; it is the feeling of lifelessness [*Leblosigkeit*], for the individual is also incapable of other feelings. Thus an individual can displease by his address, he can draw hatred upon himself, which is only due to circumstances, but he is then thus less hated by others. However, if he becomes disgusting, he sinks as low as possible [*am niedrigsten*]. (VA-Friedländer 25:597–8)

Accordingly, "contempt" *in extremis* borders, Kant says, on disgust, rather than on hatred, inasmuch as "an object of hate is only hated by his enemies" but "an object of disgust is hated by all" (VA-Friedländer 25:598). At its worst, in other words, moral vice "inhibits life" in the same way that objects of physical disgust suppress the vital forces of the body. Kant's provisional effort to explain the mystery of desire (or how ideas can exercise moving force) here leads him to assimilate a moral "non-equivalence" that Kant will later associate with vice and virtue with the visceral feelings of abhorrence that accompany the expulsion of harmful physical substances (cf. MS 6:425).

To be sure, the principles of "life" and of "activity" are not immediately continuous but become so only when human "deliberation" becomes, as it were, instinctual:

The immediate love of life sometimes does not agree with reason, for one must also live in order to be quite miserable . . . Therefore the love of life as a passion is to be approved only in a conditional way. However the instinct of life must come from deliberation, since often someone lives [in a way that brings] disgrace upon himself. Should an individual be given the choice by a higher hand whether one preferred to live here for all eternity, but in such a way as to live and be subjected to every fate . . . or to die as now happens, such a person would be horrified at living in the face of the unforeseeable end [*vor dem unabsehblichen Ende zu leben erschrecken*]. (VA-Friedländer 25:615)

Even though the existence of a human being is good “in and for itself,” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:619), dying “as now happens” would be preferable to living on indefinitely if one did not have the “hope” to which a “steadfast” adherence to rational principles lends support (VA-*Friedländer* 25:624; cf. KpV 5:123).

It is thus only through “good will” (or, alternatively, “good character”) that a human being becomes “good in himself.” To achieve that state, however, “concepts” (like that of good and evil, justice and injustice) “must become incentives.” To be sure, as the transcripts immediately continue, “concepts” are *not* “incentives,” since “objects of understanding” differ from “objects of feeling” (for the same reason, one surmises, that the faculty of “cognition” differs from that of “feeling pleasure and displeasure”). Accordingly, we “lack insight” into how “concepts can arouse feelings” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:649); still “it happens” (*es geschieht doch*) (VA-*Friedländer* 25:650).

Whence, then, the might (*Macht*) by which human beings can resolve to act according to principles? Kant offers the following suggestion:

The incentive to act in accordance with good principles could well be the idea that if all were to act this way, this earth would be a paradise. This drives me to contribute something to this effect, and if it doesn’t happen (*geschieht*), at least this doesn’t lie with me. I am, for my part, still a member of this paradise. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:650)

To the extent that the failure doesn’t lie with me, I already belong in such an ideal world. But that morally consoling thought does not satisfy the reflective human being’s demand to see where we are actually headed.

4. “World history” (*Welthistorie*) as the “history of humanity” (*Geschichte der Menschheit*)

Kant had earlier called for a “world history” that has yet to be written, one that would supply the anthropological knowledge absent which “morality and religion” cannot attain “their final purpose”: “In order for morality and religion to obtain their final purpose [*Entszweck*] knowledge of the human being must be combined with them . . . No one has yet written a world history [*Welthistorie*] that was at the same time a history of humanity [*Geschichte der Menschheit*]” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:472).¹⁵ With such world

¹⁵ In subsequent versions of the *Anthropology*, Kant will title Part Two “Characteristik.” In the published *Anthropology* he defines “the character of a living being” as that which “allows its determination [*Bestimmung*] to be cognized in advance” (A 7:329).

Table 9.1. *Arrangement of Faculties in Anthropologie Friedländer.*

Principium of life (nature)	Principium of activity (freedom)	
(body)	(<i>Gemüth</i> {1})	<i>Gemüth</i> {2}
constitution	aptitude	heart
complexion	talent	character (principium of free action from principles)
temperament (1)	temperament (2)	

history in mind, Kant turns, in Part Two, from empirical psychology (whose conventional divisions, according to Baumgarten’s text, Kant had loosely followed in Part One) to “anthropology” as such, which he here describes as knowledge of the rules governing the “phenomena” of human beings, with a view to making “use” of them (VA-Friedländer 25:624). Kant orders those phenomena roughly as follows in Table 9.1.¹⁶

Both body and *Gemüth* are animated by the “principium of life” or “nature” simply. But *Gemüth* also gives expression to the “principium of activity” or “freedom.” (Temperament also swings both ways, making “physiognomy,” at this moment of Kant’s thinking, an especially important subject of anthropological study.) Accordingly, *Gemüth* is (partially) subject to “approval” and “disapproval.” We are responsible not for what nature furnishes (i.e. aptitude, talent, and temperament (version 1)), but for the “use” we make of it, and, in particular, for whether that use is determined by (in ascending order of praiseworthiness) (1) a good *Gemüth* (version 2), or readiness in learning from others; (2) a good heart, or activity that originates in sensibility but contingently accords with fundamental principles; or (3) good character, or activity that necessarily accords with fundamental principles (VA-Friedländer 25:628–9).

Character, or the “the employment of our power of choice to act according to rules and principles,” is the “principium of free actions from principles,” and constitutes the “value of a human being in and for itself” (VA-Friedländer 25:630; 649). Character is “erected from concepts,” and it can compensate, given sufficient strength of will, for (other) failings of *Gemüth* and heart (as in the famous case of Socrates, who acquired good character despite such failings) (VA-Friedländer 25:253). At the same time, not everyone possesses the “germ” (*Keim*) necessary to be able to acquire a character, a germ specifically lacking, as Kant here claims, in all “oriental nations,” who “represent [things] to [them]selves” through “shape

¹⁶ Baumgarten (1757), *Metaphysica*, pars III (“Psychologia”), reprinted (Ref 15:3–54).

[*Gestalt*] and intuition,” but are “incapable of what a concept requires” (VA-Friedländer 25:651). As a result, no “oriental nation” is “in a position to explain a single property of morality or of justice through concepts.” Nor, indeed, is any capable of philosophy, mathematics, or any other conceptual “insight” (VA-Friedländer 25:655). Both “taste” and a true “love of honor” are similarly beyond them (VA-Friedländer 25:556).

Such principles include moral “laws,” which hold without exception (VA-Friedländer 25:633). At the same time, to be rule-ridden – i.e. to seize on maxims and apply them unbendingly – is the mark of a mere “pedant”¹⁷ (VA-Friedländer 25:539, 635). Discerning what Kant earlier called the “spirit” of the law requires, then, not only understanding but a certain “maturity of judgment,” a maturity not acquired before the age of forty – an age when one is also capable of choosing a wife wisely, i.e. of avoiding both the impetuosity of youth (which becomes fixed on a woman’s physical shape) and the miserliness of old age (which thinks only of her money) (cf. VA-Friedländer 25:633, 654, 683).¹⁸

In sum: good character involves a harmony of sensibility and understanding that resembles the organic harmony that accompanies the state of physical maturity.¹⁹ At the same time freedom, which Kant here calls “the greatest life of the human being,” boosts the principle of life to the highest possible pitch (VA-Friedländer 25:560).

Though he distinguishes between good character and its outward signs (whose discernment falls to “physiognomy”), Kant also insists that one can recognize one’s own (good) character through inner sense. He does not distinguish, as in his later moral writings, between the merely “empirical” character that is available to us (through both inner and outer signs) and the “intelligible” or noumenal character that, according to his later view, is necessarily hidden from us (see Cohen (2008)).

As for *bad* character (as distinguished from none at all), the main cause is a lack of discipline (VA-Friedländer 25:653) – i.e. “the constraint of inclination through rules” (VA-Friedländer 25:651) – a deficiency for which civil order (*bürgerlichen Ordnung*) is the primary remedy (VA-Friedländer

¹⁷ On women’s peculiar suitability for remedying this defect, see VA-Friedländer 25:707.

¹⁸ In the published *Anthropology*, Kant adds a second crucial age – around sixty – which he there identifies as the age at which “wisdom” is acquired (A 7:201). (Not altogether coincidentally, perhaps, Kant was sixty when he published the *Groundwork*, in which the principle of autonomy, along with “*Achtung* for the law” as a rational incentive of the will, rather than as a matter of merely outward honor, appears for the first time.) On Kant’s treatment of “respect for the law” in the earlier *Remarks*, see Clewis (2009), 53–5.

¹⁹ Character is, as he says, the main thing in a human being “that everything runs toward” (VA-Friedländer 25:648).

25:684). There is a crucial difference among European nations, however, between those that can be disciplined only through force (*Gewalt*), and those that can be disciplined through “respect [*Achtung*] for universal law,” or “law,” as the text also puts it, “that agrees [*stimmt*] with every freedom”:

When human beings have the faculty of being capable of being disciplined through law and not through force, this already indicates a sublime talent. This is what is noble in civil order, that when there is a law, all respect it. (VA-Friedländer 25:674)

From civil order there arises, in turn:

Regularity, order, reciprocal determination of one member by the others and thus a whole of humanity . . . [and with it] the development of talents, the concept of right and of morality, and the . . . greatest perfection of which a people is capable. (VA-Friedländer 25:680)

But Kant is not yet done. In order to perfect his “humanity,” man must, it seems, do violence to his “animality,” owing to the gap that separates man’s “natural” from his “civic” maturity – that is to say, the age at which he can reproduce his kind and the age at which he can marry and support a family (VA-Friedländer 25:682–3). The disorders of the civilized condition arise, as *Émile* had shown, from the transformation of a sexual desire that is easy to satisfy in a state of natural “simplicity” into a demand for preference over others that is insatiable in principle (cf. A 7:325):²⁰

One has accordingly believed that Rousseau preferred the natural to the artificial human being, and his opinion seems really to have inclined toward this side. But on the other side, it serves to arouse the attention of the philosopher to investigate how the perfections of the civil condition should be formed [*gebildet*] so that the perfections of nature are not destroyed, and nature is done no violence. (VA-Friedländer 25:684)

The negative happiness of nature consists in the absence of misery and vice; but it lacks the positive element that requires virtue (VA-Friedländer 25:685) and, with it, a concept of the law (VA-Friedländer 25:688). Accordingly, the human being is “actually determined” not merely to seek his own private happiness but “to make himself completely happy and good as a member of society” or of “the whole” (VA-Friedländer 25:690).

A “survey of the entire plan of politics and education” reveals, moreover, how such a state might actually arise (VA-Friedländer 25:689, 691) – on the one hand, through the “proper education” of “teachers and priests” so that

²⁰ Rousseau (1969), 493, 496; cf. Bem 20:24, 57, 132.

“pure moral concepts” might prevail among them and eventually reach “the schools of rulers.” And yet inasmuch as “the constraint of authorities reaches no further than the external civil order,” it supports merely an “outward propriety,” by which humanity will have “lost more than we have gained” (as Rousseau had seemingly feared) (VA-Friedländer 25:691). To be sure, the habit of propriety gives rise to *Achtung* for the law, as men find honor in good conduct, in which “each fears the moral judgment of others.” Still, *Achtung* for the law, which (here) rests merely on the opinion of others, is not enough to bring about “the kingdom of God on earth,” which requires “the inward constraint of conscience,” or true character (VA-Friedländer 25:692–3). Since in nature “everything is designed to achieve its greatest possible perfection,” the germ for the perfection of our humanity must likewise be present, just as a “man grows from an embryo” (VA-Friedländer 25:694). Kant here ventures the faint suggestion that those human beings in whom the moral germ is presently lacking might someday be “transposed” to a condition (perhaps on some other planet?) in which they too might achieve their full human perfection. To limit our horizon to the present, to assume things must remain as they are now, is to be guilty of a “lazy philosophy.” Instead,

The philosopher must make his concepts known, and present [*vortragen*] them for closer consideration. Teachers must form character, so that rulers might have insight into this and manage to bring it about. In this way such a condition would exist that we have no hope of living [to see] [*erleben haben*]. This condition cannot be destroyed, but will last as long as it pleases God to maintain our earthly body . . . Nature will always suffice until such a paradise on earth arises. (VA-Friedländer 25:695)

Like the earth itself, on which day and night are gradually becoming more equal, the human race is slowly overcoming the physical limitations to which climactic extremes formerly gave rise. Such a consideration (*Betrachtung*) not only is “very agreeable,” because it “is an idea that is possible” (VA-Friedländer 25:696). It also answers directly to the “misologist’s” demand that reason enable us to “look toward the goal and end of all things,” by situating that demand pragmatically, or with a view to human use (VA-Friedländer 25:655).

But this projection of human reason’s (this-)worldly “limits” still does not exhaust Kant’s task. Two issues still remain: both the gap between our natural and civil maturity, and the weakness and (apparent) imperfection of the female sex. Indeed, it is in regard to that apparent imperfection that a philosophically informed anthropology and human “interest” intersect

most closely, providing “tests” of “how the human being is to be studied” (VA-Friedländer 25:697; cf. Rousseau (1969), 700).

Following Rousseau, Kant argues that female nature can only be fully observed under conditions of refinement, in which certain dispositions of her nature compensating for her weakness have been able to develop (VA-Friedländer 25:700). Among these is a natural artfulness in ruling men without (external) compulsion (cf. Rousseau (1969), 695–6):

The greatest union of society and the most perfect state of society must happen without compulsion. This, however, only occurs through inclination, and hence through women . . . True, by means of compulsion the civil order produces a civil society, yet a perfect inner unity should be established, and to this inner union, which happens without constraint, woman contributes everything [*trägt das Frauenzimmer alles bei*]. (VA-Friedländer 25:701)

In the perfected domestic union at which “nature aims,” the woman dominates (*herren*) through inclination, while the man rules (*regieren*) through understanding, the one according to mood (*Laune*), the other in accordance with law (*Gesetz*) (VA-Friedländer 25:717–18).²¹ Without such moving forces of “action and reaction,” human beings would “fuse together” into “lifeless” inactivity and quiet (VA-Friedländer 25:719). That women are not capable of “principles,” but aim only to maintain the household, is thus no matter for reproach (VA-Friedländer 25:720). And it may help counter a certain rule-bound “pendantry” in matters of domestic economy, to which men especially are prone (VA-Friedländer 25:469, 338, 635).²²

In sum: natural misanthropy, misogyny, and misology (the three perversions of “reflection” that Kant had earlier specifically compared) are here answered in a single stroke, accomplishing via the history of humanity a reconciliation similar to the “harmony” of soul and body to which “personality” leads individuals (cf. Rousseau (1969), 778).

Indeed, as a brief final section on “education” makes clear, it is only through such “insight” into “the order of nature,” revealing traces of “God’s will and law” (VA-Friedländer 25:728), that moral and religious education (about whose ineffectiveness Kant had earlier complained (VA-Friedländer 25:471–2)) has hope of ultimate success. World history of the sort Kant has in mind thus becomes a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy – a case of foresight, as distinguished from mere “reverie,” in which *Gemüth* and understanding perfectly co-operate (cf. VA-Friedländer 25:531–5).

²¹ For Rousseau, wives are the “ministers,” husbands the “monarchs” (Rousseau (1969), 766).

²² Kant cites the humorous example of a scholar who, informed that the house was on fire, replied that that was his wife’s business.

5. Postscript: Count Verri (and beyond)

A subsequent letter to Hertz, dated November 1776, begins with an apology for Kant's long personal and public silence, including the delayed appearance of Kant's long-promised major philosophic study. Kant describes the latter, which now includes a "critique, discipline, canon, and architectonic of *pure reason*," as a "major object" that obstructs his other projects "like a dam," but that that he now believes to have in his possession but for a few "final obstacles" (C 10:199, original emphasis).

If his earlier letter to Hertz had emphasized the intimate connection between speculative and empirical knowledge, this one urges the importance, in attempting to survey the whole field of pure reason, of leaving everything empirical behind. And if the earlier letter had expressed high hopes for the new field of anthropology, he now apologizes for a certain "faithlessness" in having turned away from the technically demanding task at hand to topics he found more enjoyable.

That change in focus is reflected in his subsequent course on anthropology (the Pillau Lectures, delivered the winter semester of 1777–8) which now describes the very "concept of human nature" as a "problem" with "many difficulties" for which "education" no longer furnishes an at least approximate solution (as was seemingly the case in *Friedländer*) (VA-Pillau 25:839):

Character of the Human Species or the concept of human nature in general. There are many difficulties with this problem. For the appearances in different ages do not show how the human being is constituted, but only how he will be constituted at the time and under these circumstances. They do not allow us to cognize what kinds of germs lie hidden in the soul of the human being. – The predispositions for morality that lie in human nature are discovered by us through education [*Erziehung*], but we cannot know whether a far better education might be thought up. (VA-Pillau 25:838)

Nature and freedom now stand in opposition without apparent means of reconciliation (VA-Pillau 25:733). And history no longer culminates in a potential "paradise on earth," but remains open-ended, with a new emphasis on the role of invention and discovery (almost entirely eclipsing the relation of the sexes, his discussion of which is now perfunctory), from agriculture and writing to Rousseau's essay on inequality. Kant now speaks of *Geist* (or, alternatively, of "spontaneity") as giving "unity to all faculties" through a "principium of rules, of manifoldness in the whole, and of the new." His earlier confident insistence on the "unity of life" has disappeared, apparently for good.

One suspects that these new trends were partly abetted by Kant’s reading of Pietro Verri, whose theories of pain and pleasure are approvingly cited both here and in all subsequent versions of the *Anthropology*, including the one he finally published in 1798/1800.

Feeling of pleasure and displeasure. This is a very important and indispensable matter, not only because it contains the principles of human passions, but also the maxims that teach against them, and besides, a book has just come out by an Italian, which treats this matter . . . There have been many (including this) Italian author . . . who have said that it is impossible to determine gratification and have insight into it. But we are defining it thus: Gratification is the feeling of the promotion of life. Not that the feeling of life is a gratification; we feel also through pain that we are living, and even far more. (VA-Pillau 25:785)

Verri’s *Discourse on Pleasure and Pain*, which appeared in German translation in 1777, conclusively established, in Kant’s considered opinion, that living involves more pain than pleasure, and that “equanimity,” as he had earlier conceived it, falls outside the limits of the humanly possible (cf. A 7:231).²³ If so, Kant’s related rethinking of the relation between organic and moral “life” may have helped him overcome one of the final critical “obstacles” obstructing the emergence of “transcendental idealism” in its final critical form.

²³ For a fuller discussion, see Shell (2009).

CHAPTER 10

*Indispensable education of the being of
reason and speech*

G. Felicitas Munzel

Instruction in universities is properly this, to cultivate the capacity of reason, and to get [students] into the habit of the method of ratiocinating, and to establish the appropriate maxims of reason. Thereby one . . . practices using reason.

(VA-Friedländer 25:547)

[The use of reason] does not come of itself like that of the feet, from frequent exercise, especially when it concerns attributes which cannot be so directly exhibited in common experience.

(KpV 5:162–3)

Reason must first be practiced in being subject to its own law.

(D 8:145)

With regard to the schooling of reason and of character, what must be attended to is that the child cognize everything based on reasons and that it act from principles.

(VA-Friedländer 25:724)

[The two sciences of practical philosophy and anthropology] cannot subsist as one without the other, [for] . . . one must know human beings in order to know whether they are capable of performing all that is demanded of them. The consideration of a rule is useless, if one cannot make people prepared to fulfill it.

(VMo-Mrongovius, 27.2.2:1398)

Morality must be combined with knowledge of humanity.

(VA-Friedländer 25:472)

Morality requires anthropology for its application to human beings.

(G 4:412)

These seemingly random citations from Kant's writings spanning the years from 1775–6 to 1788 reflect a sustained set of concerns and connections

which continue into his critical philosophy, but which scholars often find difficult to reconcile: (1) Kant's account of practical reason and a call for the education or cultivation of reason; (2) the relation of rationally based moral principles and the empirical science of anthropology. For Kant's students, the latter relation was highlighted in the very way his lectures were scheduled. Each of his fourteen lectures on morality were always given in conjunction with his lectures on anthropology, in the same semester. As Werner Stark puts it, in its presentation, there was "no morality without anthropology" and, in the decade of the 1770s, it was equally the case that there was "no anthropology without morality" (Stark (1997), 7).¹ The student manuscripts indicate that Kant necessarily had to count on students taking both lectures in the same semester and had to take care that the respective lectures did not contradict one another. The challenge, then, is to recover these relations – morality, the schooling of reason, and the science of anthropology – for the contemporary reader.

Recognition of the early expression of these themes and of their reoccurrence in the critical period of Kant's writings lends importance to giving an analysis of their appearance in Kant's *Lectures on Anthropology*. In this essay I will focus on three sections in the *Anthropologie Friedländer*: "On the Use of Reason with Regard to the Practical," "On the Character of Humanity in General," and "On Education." One finds that ultimately the education or cultivation of reason is intrinsic to the very realization or nature of the being of reason and speech (as Kant here distinguishes human beings from other animal species). In order to understand this one needs to get a clear understanding of the sense of "reason" and, in particular, of the sense of the "use" of reason that is operative in Kant's account. The inquiry (into the nature of this being and its faculty of reason) is central to the anthropological investigation and so one needs also to understand the nature of this science as Kant conceives of it. Toward these ends, the analysis in this chapter will proceed in three parts: the science of anthropology and its subject of inquiry, the sense of reason and its use (as well as its misuses) that are at stake in the discussion, and the resulting need and challenges for education.

¹ In his paper Stark expands on this point. Basing his conclusion also on Kant's letter to Marcus Herz at the end of 1773 (depending on the edition, x, §71, 136–9, or §79, 144 ff.), Stark claims that Kant here is already explicit about the fact that "a change in his lectures on morality is connected with the establishment of his lectures on anthropology"; that it is clear both that "morality and anthropology must be separated" and that "at the same time neither can be considered independent of the other" (Stark (1997), 6–8).

I. The science of anthropology and its subject of inquiry

Already this early Kant speaks of – indeed underscores – that his sense of the science of anthropology entails an “idea,” an idea which “all anthropologies” to date “have not yet had” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:472). The lectures begin with a twofold sense of the notion of “world”: “nature” or “the world as an object of outer sense,” and the “human being” or “the world as an object of inner sense” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:469). This division in turn entails a twofold knowledge, “physics” (as “knowledge of the object of outer sense”) and anthropology (the “knowledge of human beings as the object of inner sense”), as well as “twofold relations” into which “human beings can enter” and for which they require these two respective fields of study (VA-*Friedländer* 25:473, 469). Anthropology is not a matter of the study of human affairs; one does not acquire this knowledge by traveling the world. Rather it concerns itself with the “nature of humanity,” a nature which, unlike the conduct, particular properties, or human states of affairs, does not change (VA-*Friedländer* 25:471). “Anthropology is thus a pragmatic knowledge of what results from our nature, but it is not a physical or geographical knowledge, for that is bound to time and place, and is not constant” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:471). It is “not a description of human beings,” but it is a “knowledge of humanity” that is “at the same time my knowledge” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:471). Its purpose is to bring the “phenomena” of “human beings and their conduct” “under rules” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:472). These “pragmatic doctrines” are “doctrines of prudence,” for the “subject,” the “human being,” must be studied in order to ascertain whether “he can even fulfill what we require that he ought to do” (a statement that echoes what Kant says also in his lectures on morality) (VA-*Friedländer* 25:471). It is here in the text that Kant next observes that “morality must be combined with the knowledge of humanity,” an observation that he also repeats in his critical writings (VA-*Friedländer* 25:472). Effectively, then, the idea of anthropology that Kant has in mind is the “science” of “prudence” that is the necessary counterpart to the science of morality (VA-*Friedländer* 25:471). As the study of inner sense, this prudence is not a matter of an inquiry into physical powers, external relations, material resources, or anything else that belongs to the highly variable “fortuitous behavior” of human beings. It is a question of the inner capabilities inherent to and definitive of human nature per se. Its etymological roots (that relate it to foresight or providential care) do indeed connect prudence with the question of sound judgment in practical affairs, or, as Kant refers to it throughout the text, with “skill.” Such “skills” to “make proper use of

everything” require “secure principles in terms of which we can proceed” (VA-Friedländer 25:471). The ultimate “purpose” is the “complete perfection of human beings,” and so it is clear that however definitive of human nature the capabilities at issue are, development is required to realize their full potential (VA-Friedländer 25:681). To gain further insight into the capabilities and skills in question, we turn next to Kant’s account of humanity in these lectures.

In the section “On the Character of Humanity in General” Kant explicitly from the outset aligns his discussion with Rousseau’s distinction of the savage and civilized states. The “human being,” writes Kant, “has two determinations, one with regard to humanity, and one with regard to animality” (VA-Friedländer 25:682). Again, consonant with Rousseau’s account, Kant sees these two determinations in conflict with one another: “if we want to achieve the perfection of humanity, then we must do violence to the determination of animality” (VA-Friedländer 25:682).² However, “nature’s purpose” to “preserve the species” means that both determinations must still be able to be maintained. It must be possible for the human being to “cultivate his reason” and at the same time, “as an animal, he thus would have to be built in such a way that it could also stand him in good stead if he would cultivate his reason” (VA-Friedländer 25:677). In the savage state, the human animal has “no use of reason” (VA-Friedländer 25:675). The determination to humanity depends upon the cultivation of reason and speech and, in turn (with reference to a treatise by Peter Moscati which Kant reviewed very favorably in 1771), the “cultivation of the germ of reason laid in our nature . . . destines us for society” (VA-Friedländer 25:675). Kant has many interesting things to say about the human being as an animal and about the transition from the savage to the civilized state, but for our

² Kant repeats this observation elsewhere, including his 1786 essay “Conjectural Beginning of Human History.” Here he reads Rousseau’s version of the problem as a variation of the discrepancy he has himself noted between nature’s intentions for the human species and the effect of the process for the individual (so, between the universal humanity and individual particularities always both actual in the living being). With that Kant acknowledges the peculiar pedagogical problematic. “In his essays on the arts and sciences and on inequality,” Kant writes, Rousseau “quite rightly shows the unavoidable conflict of culture [or cultivation, *Kultur*] with the nature of the human being as a physical species in which every individual is wholly to attain his vocation [*Bestimmung*]. However, in his *Émile*, his *Social Contract*, and other writings, he tries again to solve the more difficult problem: how cultivation must proceed so that the aptitudes of humanity as a moral species are developed as is proper to its vocation [*Bestimmung*], but also in such a way that these no longer conflict with its aptitudes as a natural species.” Since “cultivation in accordance with true principles of education” serving to develop both the “human being and the citizen” has in all likelihood not yet been initiated, much less completed, this conflict, observes Kant, has given rise to all the “real ills which oppress human life and all the vices which dishonor it” (MA 8:116).

purposes here we will focus in the remainder of this chapter on what he has to say about the being of reason and speech.

At the outset of the lectures Kant identifies the “essential difference of the human being from all animals” as consisting in the “representation of I and the power to grasp the thought”; “no thought but the thought of the I,” he writes, “lies at the basis of other thoughts.” Further, “this is the personality to be conscious of oneself” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:473). Such nascent identification of elements of inner sense and reason that continue into the critical writings is found also in the section “On the Use of Reason with Regard to the Practical.” Here Kant begins with the distinction of the understanding (“required for experience and for the assessment of appearances”) and reason (which “judges a priori before experience”) (VA-*Friedländer* 25:545). The power of reason at issue is not a matter of calculative, comparative, or relational functions as one sees (for example) in a Humean empiricist account. Rather it is a question of ratiocination, an elevation of reason beyond the limits of experience (VA-*Friedländer* 25:546). In this regard (as we will explore in the next section) we can either avoid using reason altogether (that is, not engage in ratiocination), we can use it well (based on an identification and examination of its guiding principles), we can misuse it, or we can fall into a state of misology (when we get frustrated with failure to find the answers we are seeking). Reason in this sense is a “faculty of cognition from concepts” and so, in turn, it is the proper basis for morality since pure morality “must be cognized from concepts” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:552).

The definition of all aspects of human nature with reference to reason and thereby bringing human nature and human interest under the umbrella of the human moral vocation is familiar to us from the course of Kant’s writings through the critical period. Reading the anthropology alongside the moral writings allows one to see the continuity and development of this account of human nature. As examples, the following two passages from the *Critique of Practical Reason* give us the critical expression of the dual animal and human natures of the human being and their relation from the standpoint of reason:

Man is a being of needs, so far as he belongs to the world of sense, and to this extent his reason certainly has an inescapable responsibility from the side of his sensuous nature to attend to its interest and to form practical maxims with a view to the happiness of this and, where possible, of a future life. But still he is not so completely animal as to be indifferent to everything reason says on its own . . . He needs reason, to consider at all times his weal and woe. But he has reason for a yet higher purpose, namely to consider

also what is in itself good or evil, which pure and sensuously disinterested reason alone can judge, and furthermore, to distinguish this estimation from a sensuous estimation and to make the former the supreme condition of the latter. (KpV 5:61–2)

The origin of duty lies in

personality, the freedom and independence from the mechanism of nature regarded as a capacity of a being subject to special laws (pure practical laws given by its own reason), so that the person belonging to the world of sense is subject to his own personality so far as he belongs to the intelligible world. For it is then not to be wondered at that man, as belonging to two worlds, must regard his own being in relation to his second and higher vocation (*Bestimmung*) with reverence, and the laws of this vocation with the deepest respect. (KpV 5:86–7)

The inclusion of the notion of “personality” here adumbrates the three-part division that Kant makes explicit in his *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*. In this text, the specific hallmark of human nature is sharpened to the rational capacities of setting purposes and making choices (*Wille* and *Willkür*) (R 6:28). Indeed here we are to understand by “human nature only the subjective ground of the employment of freedom as such,” which is the “first basis of the adoption” of maxims, a basis found in our capacity of choice (R 6:21); our resulting state of being is an “effect [*Wirkung*] of a free power of choice” (R 6:44). In this text Kant describes the “entire determination of the human being,” or entire set of purposes making up the whole purpose of human existence, as a three-part hierarchy under the rubric of the “original aptitude for good in human nature”: our aptitudes (*Anlagen*) as (1) living, animal beings (our animality), (2) living, rational beings (our humanity), and (3) rational, morally accountable beings (our personality) (R 6:26). Several passages later, he further qualifies these “elements”: “we are here speaking only of those aptitudes that relate immediately to the capacity of desire and the exercise of the power of choice” (R 6:28).

As we know from Kant’s other writings, for example the familiar opening passages of his essay on enlightenment, while genuine choice-making requires thinking for oneself, consciously bringing the appropriate principles to bear on one’s judgments, it is easy to be lazy, to be, in a word, immature, to follow unreflectively the advice of the touted expert in a given field, and so to be subject to prejudice (unexamined opinion) (WA 8:33). It is, then, ultimately a question of attaining maturity in one’s use of reason, a use whose full scope is the “world” understood as the “sum total of

all relations into which human beings may enter” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:469). As I have argued in *Kant’s Conception of Pedagogy. Toward Education for Freedom*, the critical account of these relations is the spheres of the relation of the human mind to the world – theoretical, practical (moral), aesthetic, teleological, and virtuous (ethical) (Munzel (2012), Chapter 4). In the concluding *Methodenlehren* (Doctrines of Method or Ways of Instruction), of each of the critical writings Kant summarizes the guiding principles for the proper use of reason in each of these spheres, principles that teachers, those who would “pave the path to wisdom which everyone should follow and keep others from going astray,” must Socratically guide students to become cognizant of and to adopt in their judgments (KpV 5:163). In his published *Anthropology*, Kant describes wisdom as the “idea of perfection in the practical use of reason, a use in accordance with law,” which “cannot in the least degree be infused by another; each must give rise to it from within themselves” (A 7:200).

In sum, the growth and development of the human being is a process involving a transition from living at the level of one’s animal nature to realizing one’s human nature as a being of reason and speech and ultimately as a moral being. Inherent to this process is the requirement of education, specifically the cultivation of reason, *Kultur der Vernunft*.³ As we saw in our opening quote, already in his 1775–6 *Friedländer* anthropology lectures, Kant observes that “instruction in universities is properly this, to cultivate the capacity of reason, and to get [students] into the habit of the method of ratiocinating, and to establish the appropriate maxims of reason. Thereby one . . . practices using reason” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:547).

We now return to this text for the issues in the use and cultivation of reason that Kant identifies at this early stage.

2. Lack, use, and misuse of reason

Consonant with the goal of “animating reason” and “producing ratiocinating human beings,” the sense of reason at issue entails cognizing “something

³ *Kultur* (culture or cultivation) is the term Kant uses to speak explicitly of the educative process of reason; indeed, Kant played a contributing role in its adoption and meaning in the language. His own first use of it comes together with *Bildung* in his 1765–6 “Announcement” of his lectures. The context is his claim that the logic text chosen for the lectures lends itself to the study of both “the *Bildung* of the active and sound, albeit common, understanding” and “the *Kultur* of the more refined and learned reason” (N 2:311). His next use of *Kultur* comes in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, the work that presents the critical philosophy as indispensable for the cultivation of reason. For a detailed discussion see Munzel (2012), 70–81. See also Munzel (1999), Chapter 5 and 281–5, for concept of *Kultur*.

due to universal bases and principles”; the “faculty of excerpting something from universal bases” allows one to “elevate one’s reason beyond the limits of practical use” (with “practical” here aligned with the realm of experience) (VA-Friedländer 25:546). In order to realize this elevation one must get “the capacity of reason into the habit of judging about all universal principles” (VA-Friedländer 25:547). The instruction which thus cultivates the capacity of reason does not turn students into scholars; rather, in becoming practiced in using reason, they become accustomed to “reflect about everything, what bases this or that has” and thereby are enabled to use their “reason in the world” and eventually “acquire insights” for themselves (VA-Friedländer 25:547). Such instruction serves also to “remedy carelessness” in the use of reason (which Kant notes may appear as if it were a lack of reason) (VA-Friedländer 25:546–7). The inquiry into “the causes and bases of an event” seemingly has to do precisely with the world of experience, but what one sees in these lectures is a foreshadowing of what becomes key to Kant’s critical distinction: cognition starting with experience but not therefore arising from experience (KrV A1/B1). Thus establishing the “appropriate maxims of reason” (as he calls them in the anthropology lectures) whereby judgment proceeds is central.

The opposite is not to engage in such judging at all. The avoidance of the use of reason takes a number of forms. In the first place “emulation” or “imitation” constitutes the very “ruin of reason” (and so we have here a clear adumbration of the fundamental maxim of thinking for oneself) (VA-Friedländer 25:547). Those who find the use of reason difficult are more than happy to appeal to “universally accepted opinion and thereby give up the use of reason” (VA-Friedländer 25:547). There are consequences for civilized life. Rulers find it to be to their advantage to “deprive people of the use of reason” by making them “superstitious and shackling them to prejudices” (VA-Friedländer 25:546). One way they seek to achieve this, writes Kant, is to “prohibit the printing press, for its freedom is a means of animating reason, of cultivating knowledge, and therefore of producing ratiocinating human beings” (VA-Friedländer 25:546). However, Kant goes on, reason rebels “against illegitimate compulsion; it wants grounds”; moreover, such a government is ultimately “very weak” since the “more ignorant and stupid the people are, all the more obstinate they also are” (VA-Friedländer 25:546). Those who do gladly give up the use of reason tend to appeal to “fate” (or “blind necessity”) and “fortune” (or “blind chance”); in this scenario wonders, birthmarks, meanings of dreams, the divining rod, and the influences of the heavens, of the moon, and of magnetic forces become the sorts of things to which the causes of events

are attributed (VA-*Friedländer* 25:547–8). In the critical philosophy, Kant will spell out the consequences for the enterprise of philosophy itself. He asserts that the skeptical effort to “withdraw” from the “tedious business of reason” is self-deceiving; it only “seems to be, as it were, the short path to a permanent philosophical tranquility, or at least the main road favored by those who think that by scoffingly despising all investigations of this kind they can give themselves philosophical airs” (KrV A757/B785). He delineates two fundamental mistakes, that of a perverse reason (*perversa ratio* – which hypostatizes purposive unity in nature and forces anthropomorphized concepts on it) and that of a lazy reason (*ignava ratio* – which effectively exempts itself from the investigation of nature altogether by appealing to the “inscrutable decree of supreme wisdom,” instead of proceeding to seek out causes by following a “regulative principle of the systematic unity of a teleological connection”) (KrV A690–4/B718–22).⁴ So seen, the problem of establishing and appropriately using the guiding principles for the judgment of reason in all relations to the world in which human beings find themselves is clearly identified in the anthropology lectures; the articulation of the appropriate principles and their use is the ongoing work of the critical philosophy.

Other distinctions found in the *Friedländer* anthropology lectures include those between sound and speculative reason and between reason and the understanding. Initially Kant says that to ratiocinate is to use reason speculatively (which is its use beyond the limits of experience, for which it has “rules”), but then he distinguishes also reason’s “correct use” that can be “confirmed by experience”; the latter is “sound reason” and its “maxim” is

as follows: not to accept as valid any rule in its use than this, [the one] whereby the most universal use of reason is possible, and whereby its use is facilitated. Every nature maintains itself; hence reason also maintains itself, if it does not admit any other rule than such whereby its use is possible. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:548–50)

So the appeals to fate, fortune, wonders, and spirits carrying “on their play in this world” – appeals that all entail the cessation of the use of reason – are rejected by sound reason (VA-*Friedländer* 25:549). The rejection of such appeals is “not a theoretical proposition, but a maxim of reason” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:549). “Through its maxims, sound reason directs our

⁴ For a more detailed discussion of Kant’s critical examination of these issues in the use of reason see Munzel (2012), Chapter 4, especially 238–47, for a discussion of these errors and the skeptical withdrawal.

judgments" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:550). While in its quest for self-preservation reason "does not permit that whereby its use is nullified," Kant finds the "lack of reason" to be "nothing unusual" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:549, 553). To overcome this lack is central to the understanding of enlightenment as a pedagogical enterprise.

Kant further points to a danger for "thoughtful persons, who conduct investigations into their future vocation and chief purposes," and ultimately "gain insight" into their "ignorance"; they find that they "cannot foresee the goal and end of all things" and end up resorting to misology. They do value reason, but renounce it because it has failed them (VA-*Friedländer* 25:553). For the reader of Kant's critical philosophy, the opening lines of the *Critique of Pure Reason* come quickly to mind. This "peculiar fate" of reason to pursue questions it cannot adequately answer is the very point of departure for the critical investigation. In the *Friedländer Lectures* Kant does immediately observe that for the individual who has "gotten into the habit of making use of reason" it "is futile to free oneself from it; who already has a propensity thereto, reflects all his life" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:553). Again, in the A Preface of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant acknowledges that the state of the metaphysical questions has lapsed into an understandable "weariness," but continues to affirm that a permanent disengagement is not an option: to carry this to an attitude of "indifferentism" is to invoke the "mother of chaos and night," he writes, since "it is futile to feign indifference concerning inquiries whose object *cannot be indifferent* to human nature" (KrV Ax, original emphasis).

Over and above the issues of the lack of the use of reason (prejudice) and, at the other end of the spectrum, the frustration that can lead to misology, Kant also catalogs a malfunctioning of the powers of the mind that ranges from indisposition, to sickness, to infirmity. Occasion and circumstances (for example, degree of fatigue, difficult work, agreeable company, activities and distractions of life) result in the "disposition of the mind" being "very variable from one day to another, indeed from one hour to another," and so impact how well or not one is disposed for "deep reflection" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:553–4). Sicknesses too can be remedied (just as they can in the case of sicknesses in the body). In the case of the mind, Kant identifies a twofold sickness: weakness (which can be brought about by something like much grief), or a disturbance of the powers of the mind (which can be brought about by a high fever) (VA-*Friedländer* 25:554). Infirmity refers to a "crippled state of mind," where the "condition for the regular use of the powers of mind is lacking" (as in the case of "insanity") (VA-*Friedländer* 25:554). Identifying such problems exemplifies the role of the science of

anthropology in determining whether the human being can “fulfill what we require that he ought to do.”

The distinction between the understanding and reason involves the nature of the relation to experience as well as the ability to go beyond experience. In this regard Kant introduces the notion of the “idea” and foreshadows its meaning as a practical task defined by reason. He speaks here of cognition “by means of the understanding from experience”; cognition by means of reason is also possible in regard to these things, but

there are many things which can only be cognized solely through reason. These are such [things] where reason provides the idea as the basis, for example, virtue. Experience indeed gives us examples of virtue, yet I must still have the concept to judge such. For all cases of cognition, where it is a question not of how something is, but of how it ought to be, there reason is always necessary, since reason indicates how things must be, but experience only how they are . . . The cognition of things which is the model, according to which something is to be arranged, it is this cognition which is the idea . . . The idea is therefore different from experience; it is found in reason and not in experience. Hence it is false to say, a virtuous man, but [one should say] one who pursues the idea of virtue in a way so as to be equal to it. (VA-Friedländer 25:550–1)

The stage is here set for the conception of reason as the basis for morality.

The stage is also set for Kant’s cosmopolitan conception of philosophy. That reason engages in an examination of “its vocation, of its limits, of its use” is stated explicitly in these lectures: “this cognition of its sphere is the architectonic use of reason” (VA-Friedländer 25:551). Kant distinguishes the “artificer of reason” (the “mathematician and physicist”) from the “one making the law of human reason known,” the one who is a “philosopher in the true sense”; this name is “also only an idea, which one must endeavor to equal” (VA-Friedländer 25:551). The parallel with a central passage of the “Architectonic” of the *Critique of Pure Reason* is remarkable:

there is also a world concept (*conceptus cosmicus*) on which the name [of philosophy] has always been based, primarily when one, as it were, personified this concept and represented it in the ideal of the philosopher as its archetype. From this point of view, philosophy is the science of the relation of all cognition to the essential purposes of human reason (*teleologia rationis humanae*), and the philosopher is not an artificer of reason, but the legislator of human reason . . .

The mathematician, the naturalist, the logician, however superior the former may be in rational cognitions in general [and whatever] progress the latter may [achieve] in philosophical cognition in particular, are yet only artificers

of reason. There is, in the ideal, still another teacher, who assigns all these [their place and] uses them as tools in order to promote the essential purposes of human reason. Him alone we should call the philosopher; but since he is himself surely not to be found anywhere, although the idea of his legislation is everywhere found in each human reason, we will thus stay strictly with the latter and determine more closely what philosophy, according to this cosmopolitan concept, prescribes for systematic unity from the standpoint of purposes.

Kant goes on to note that there can only be a single highest purpose, to which all other ends necessarily belong as means. This single, highest “final purpose is none other than the entire vocation of human beings [*die ganze Bestimmung des Menschen*] and the philosophy of it is called morality” (KrV A838–40/B866–8).⁵ In the *Friedländer Lectures* Kant concludes his reflections on the architectonic use of reason by observing that the more one “reflects upon the vocation of human reason, the more the individual approximates the philosopher” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:551). To attain to this use of reason is to be well on the way to perfect it and, with that, to perfect one’s nature as a being of reason and speech. As Kant spells it out in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, “From the entire course” of its discussion, writes Kant, a reader of the “critique will have been sufficiently persuaded” of a number of conclusions. These include the fact that

human reason, which is already dialectical by the direction [or orientation, *Richtung*] of its nature, can never dispense with such a science as one that restrains it [literally, reins it in] and one that prevents, through a scientific and completely evident self-knowledge, the havoc which a lawless, speculative reason would otherwise unfailingly wreak in morality as well as religion . . . Thus, what may be called philosophy in the genuine sense [of that term] is made up of metaphysics, both of nature and of morals, but above all, of the critique of that reason which ventures forth on its own wings, [the critique] which precedes [metaphysics] as a preparatory exercise (propaedeutic). Philosophy relates everything to wisdom, but through the path of science which, when it has once been paved, is never overgrown and permits no straying . . . [M]etaphysics [constitutes] also the completion of all cultivation of human reason, which is indispensable . . . [f]or [metaphysics] examines reason in regard to its elements and highest maxims which must underlie the very possibility of some sciences and the use of them all. (KrV A849–51/B877–9)

The use of reason in accordance with appropriate maxims and principles is important also for the effect on human animal and sensuous nature. As we

⁵ For a discussion of this principle as a formal pedagogical principle and for the sense of architectonic as a capacity for directing, lawgiving, and teaching, see Munzel (2012), [Chapter 3](#), especially 213–25.

saw above in the passage cited from the *Critique of Practical Reason*, well into his critical period Kant continues to note reason's responsibility with regard to the needs and interests of the sensible side of the human being. One finds the claim to be made even more strongly, namely that, without reason's influence, the other natural aptitudes are literally held back in the development of their own inherent potentialities. That human beings make use of their reason to think for themselves has consequences for the human sensibilities and ultimately for the forms of political organization. As Kant puts it in his essay on *Enlightenment*:

When nature has uncovered under this hard husk the germ [*Keim*] for which she cares most tenderly, namely, the propensity and calling to free thinking, this germ gradually in turn impacts [*wirkt zurück*] the *Sinnesart* [sensibilities] of the people (whereby they become more and more capable of acting [in accordance with freedom]). And, finally, it even [impacts] the principles of government which itself finds it beneficial to treat human beings, who are now more than machines, commensurate with their dignity. (WA 8:41–2)

For all of this to happen, education – and specifically the cultivation of human reason – is indispensable. As Kant put it in the *Critique of Practical Reason*, the use of reason “does not come of itself like that of the feet, from frequent exercise.” As he notes (in the passage cited from the *Critique of Pure Reason*), its use can be quite lawless and merely frequently exercising it in that fashion would wreak havoc indeed. To get to the level of the cultivation of reason, animality first has to be transformed into humanity. The full process entails a number of stages to which Kant refers throughout his writings. We turn next to the account found in the *Friedländer Lectures* (with references to some of the parallel statements found elsewhere).

3. Stages of education

The 1775–6 anthropology lectures are unique in that they have a separate section “On Education,” but other sections too, especially “On the Character of Humanity in General,” are replete with commentary on education (including many allusions to issues of the education debates of the long eighteenth century). In general, in these lectures Kant identifies four levels of “constraint”: civil order, propriety, moral order, and conscience. In his other writings he delineates four stages of education – discipline, cultivation, civilization, moralization – with many shared elements found in both versions. Much of “On the Character of Humanity in General” is devoted to the “advance from savagery to the civil constitution,” with

the “perfection of the state of human beings” bound up with the “perfection of the civil constitution” (VA-Friedländer 25:689). The basic premises are taken from Rousseau: “The human being is determined as an animal for the woods, but as a human being for society” (VA-Friedländer 25:689). In the “civil state” the “human being of nature” is “disciplined,” or “refashioned and reshaped” (through which “violence is done to nature”) (VA-Friedländer 25:684). Thus the “civil constitution is a constraint”; it is the “source of the development of talents, of the concepts of justice and all moral perfection”; it does so by maintaining a civil order that permits relations among human beings who begin from a state of mutual suspicion (VA-Friedländer 25:689, 680–8; see also 678–9, 691). While passages such as these seem to imply that the concepts of justice and morality are here viewed as empirically based, the context of the whole discussion lends itself more to the interpretation that becomes clearer in similar references in Kant’s other writings; namely the need for producing conditions under which the human and rational aptitudes can develop. The objective is to facilitate the development of all the human capacities so that they are fit for, or adequate to, the task of executing reason’s purposes. As Kant notes already in these lectures, “the germs” for the “perfection of humanity” are “innate in humanity [and] it is thus possible that they will be developed through cultivation” (VA-Friedländer 25:695; see also 694).

He also explicitly raises the question of the order of the development of the state and of human beings. Which is the “condition” of the other: “does the perfection of every single human being depend on the perfection of the state,” or is it the other way around (VA-Friedländer 25:691)? He concludes that

in the first place, one must see to it that those, who are afterwards to educate others, are [themselves] well educated. If teachers and priests were educated, if the concepts of pure morality would prevail among them, then they would also soon come to occupy the highest position, enter the schools of rulers, and through these, the whole could afterwards be educated. (VA-Friedländer 25:691)⁶

Concretely, to make real progress two things minimally would need to change in the present state of affairs: an end must be put to the wars so that attention and resources are directed to the internal condition of the state and its government, and those in power must recognize the importance of education and apply their efforts to it (in order that the “moral

⁶ As I have argued in *Kant’s Conception of Pedagogy*, ultimately the critical philosophy serves as the needed education (Munzel (2012), Chapter 3).

germs" innate to human nature will be developed through education) (VA-*Friedländer* 25:695, 696). To contribute to these changes "the philosopher must make his concepts" of the perfection of humanity and the needed constitution of the state "known," while "teachers must form character, so that the rulers would have insight" into what is needed and "bring it about" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:696). The process is a long one: "thousands of years will still be required," writes Kant, and meanwhile "nature will always be sufficient until such a paradise emerges on earth" (that is, until the "human race . . . will attain the greatest degree of perfection") (VA-*Friedländer* 25:696).

That nature has a propaedeutic pedagogical role in facilitating the cultivation of reason and promoting the development of the human species toward its fulfillment as a being of reason and speech and finally as a moral being is a point to which Kant returns throughout the critical writings. For example, in the *Critique of Pure Reason* he observes that without the "purposive unity" laid down by nature itself, we "would not have any reason, since we would have no school for it and no cultivation [of reason] through objects that would offer to it the material for such concepts of purposes" (KrV A817/B845). The operative assumption for Kant's account in the *Critique of Practical Reason* is that "human nature is so constituted" that "even subjectively, the exhibition of pure virtue can have more power over the human mind [*Gemüt*] and can provide far greater motivation" not only to effectuate the "legality of actions," but "to produce firmer resolve to prefer the law to everything else purely out of respect for it" than could ever be generated by appeals to the "attractions . . . of all that may be counted as happiness or even by all threats of pain and harm." If "human nature were not so constituted, no way of presenting the law through recommendations and roundabout means could ever bring forth morality of the comportment of one's mind [*Gesinnung*]" (KpV 5:151–2). This passage also exemplifies the relation of the science of anthropology and morality; that is, the former examines the inner capacities of human nature so that one can see whether the human being is capable of carrying out what is required. Ultimately one must attain a "cultivation" that is "a schooling that makes us responsive to higher purposes than nature itself can deliver" (KU 5:433). However, as Kant poses it as late as 1795, "the essential question in regard to the aim of perpetual peace" is what nature does on the behalf of human moral purpose, to ensure that "what human beings ought to do according to laws of freedom, but fail to do," is yet done by means of "nature's constraint" but "without jeopardizing freedom" (EF 8:365). The constraint imposed by the constitution on the "inclination to

mutual acts of violence,” Kant writes here, is a “step toward morality” but “not yet a moral step” (EF 8:375–6n).

References elsewhere in Kant’s writings to the needed transition to a civilized state include his essay *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim*, his published lectures on anthropology, and his notes “On Pedagogy.” The pedagogical role of the republican constitution is addressed most explicitly in *Perpetual Peace*. In “On Pedagogy” Kant speaks of the “negative” work of education as a discipline; it “transforms animality into humanity” and, as such, is the indispensable first step whose “omission can never be replaced” (VP 9:441, 444). In the *Anthropology* he writes that “human beings are determined by reason to be in society with others and therein to cultivate, civilize, and moralize themselves through art and science.” They are further determined by reason,

however great their propensity may be for animality (for surrendering passively to the incitements of ease and comfortable living they call happiness), instead to be active, to make themselves worthy of their humanity in battle with the hindrances adhering to them through the crudeness of nature. (A 7:324–5)

In his 1784 essay on universal history we read that the ultimate environment conducive to the complete development of all the human aptitudes is the “completely just civil constitution” under whose governance “all the germs [lying in human nature] can be developed” and human “destiny . . . here on earth may be fulfilled” (Idea 8:22, 25, 30).

Civil constraint is not, however, enough. As Kant notes in his *Friedländer Lectures*, “the constraint of the authorities does not extend to anything beyond the external civil order and the right of others”; it does not extend to matters of “decency in the good life” – that is, “to propriety and the moral life” – and so “another constraint is lacking here which could compel one in the case where civil constraint would be badly misplaced” (VA-Friedländer 25:692). The constraint of propriety entails a mutual compulsion among human beings with “regard to taste, modesty, refinement, courtesy, and decorum” (VA-Friedländer 25:692). For the further development of moral character the “concepts of morality must be purified and respect for the moral law must be *instituted*” (VA-Friedländer 25:692, original emphasis). Kant here speaks of two levels: moral constraint in which human beings pass judgment on one another about their moral conduct, and the internal constraint of conscience “where every individual, in accordance with the moral law, passes judgment about his [own] moral conduct” (VA-Friedländer 25:692, 693). Where the moral constraint is established,

“honor” would be a matter of being “regarded as an upright man by everyone,” and not a matter of having the privilege of “riding in a carriage” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:693). Moreover, “moral character,” not “outer conduct or skill,” would be of paramount importance with regard to those seeking office (VA-*Friedländer* 25:693). Where conscience has been cultivated, “this constraint, since it is an inner one, would be the strongest, and then indeed none other would be necessary” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:693).⁷

Beyond these levels of constraint pertaining to the course of humanity in history, Kant turns to the specific education of “human beings as children and as adolescents” in the section “On Education” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:723).⁸ The fourfold division of the education of children here consists in the development of nature (which pertains to health and the “proper use” of one’s “powers and sensory organs”), the “guidance of freedom” (which entails discipline of the will), the “instruction of the understanding” (which is both negative insofar as one seeks to prevent errors and positive insofar as one gives instruction), and the “development of reason and character” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:723, 724). With regard to the last, “what must be attended to is that the child cognize everything based on reasons and that it act from principles” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:724). The child must both be kept on the course “to humanity” and also be “prepared to exercise humanity toward others; the latter means that it learns to esteem highly the right of human beings and the dignity of humanity in his person.” These, writes Kant, “are the two things in the world which are holy” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:727). The further instruction at the adolescent stage involves the recognition of the “duties” one has “with regard to the human species” and the “duties” one has “in the civil order” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:727–8). Last comes “religion” which entails gaining insight into “the true relation with God” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:728).

As Kant returns to and develops these elements of education in his critical writings, his conception of education emphasizes the “cultivation of reason, as well as the fitness of all the human aptitudes for the concrete realization of reason’s ideas and principles” (Munzel (2012), 208). As I have argued, “the critical philosophy in its pedagogical role . . . is not merely

⁷ Kant returns to the notion of conscience in other writings (especially in his *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason* and his *Metaphysics of Morals*), in some texts connecting it with religion (as he does in the anthropology lectures) and in others treating it as being of a piece with practical reason. For a more detailed discussion see Munzel (forthcoming, 2013).

⁸ The influence of Rousseau’s *Émile* is evident in this section, but Kant also explicitly refers to the Philanthropin, an institute of education based on Lockean, Rousseauian, and Enlightenment principles founded in 1774 in Dessau by Johann Bernhard Basedow. Kant actively supported the school and communicated with its directors.

about reason, it is a disciplinarian and instructor for reason” (Munzel (2012), 230). The fourfold program of education referenced in the critical writings (discipline, civilization, cultivation, and moralization) may be summarized as follows.

Discipline is the negative task; unruliness (in any of its forms, whether it be that of the inclinations and passions, or the undisciplined eros of theoretical reason) must be eradicated to set the stage for the positive work of cultivation, the shaping and orienting of undeveloped natural aptitudes. The mature, formal critical sense of cultivation (as expressed in the *Critique of Judgment*) is “producing the fitness of a rational being for any purposes whatever of its choosing (thus [producing its fitness for] freedom).” (KU 5:431)

In their essence, to civilize is to cultivate taste (that is, to cultivate human sociability and manners), while to moralize is to cultivate reason (that is, to facilitate the consciousness of the moral law and make students proficient in adopting it in their judgments as the guiding maxim, thus preparing the ground for moral character). In the broadest sense, then, the development of any and all of the human aptitudes is a matter of their cultivation. As we read in the *Metaphysical Principles of Virtue* (MS 6:391, 392), for example, it is a matter of duty to “cultivate the crude aptitudes of our nature,” indeed to “cultivate all our capacities in general” (both “physical” and “moral”) for the sake of “promoting the purposes set before us by reason”; through such “cultivation we make ourselves worthy of the humanity” that is our calling.⁹

4. Conclusion

The surrounding historical philosophical context for Kant’s discussion of these themes is the ongoing pedagogical debates of the long eighteenth century.¹⁰ In these debates the issue of the cultivation of reason for its sound use in the practical affairs of life was a central theme. The developing discourse was shared at the popular, social, and political levels, as well as in educational and philosophical circles. Its leitmotif was laid down in the early seventeenth century in the *Great Didactic* by the Czech educational reformer and religious leader Jan Amos Comenius: “the human being must first be formed [*gebildet*; Latin *formatio*] to be a human being”; “nature provides the aptitudes [*Anlagen*], but only discipline [*Zucht*] produces the actual human being out of them.”¹¹ Considered retrospectively, this early

⁹ Munzel (2012), 209.

¹⁰ For a discussion of salient aspects and authors of this debate see Munzel (2012), Chapters 1 and 2.

¹¹ Comenius (2000), 40. It was published as a Latin edition in 1657 in Amsterdam, with an initial Czech edition as early as 1627; Comenius’s dates are 1592–1670.

statement that the formation of the human being is made possible by nature, but only realized by rearing and education, may be seen as setting the stage for the discussion of the ensuing centuries (Munzel (2012), 84). The statement is echoed by Kant in his notes on pedagogy: “Human beings can only become human beings through education [*Erziehung*]. They are nothing save what education makes of them. It must be noted that human beings can only be educated by human beings, who must likewise be educated” (VP 9:443). In the eighteenth century, texts for the instruction of reason (*Vernunftlehren*) abound; they include sections entitled *Methodenlehren*. As I have argued elsewhere, Kant is in agreement with his contemporaries on the great goals of the age: the achievement of a moral- and civic-minded citizenry and of human freedom. His disagreement lies both with the underlying human self-understanding and with the meanings of these terms and achievements as construed by his predecessors and contemporaries. The engagement of the thought of his contemporaries is far more explicit in the *Lectures on Anthropology* than in the critical writings, and so for the contemporary reader, as for Kant’s students, they provide a window into the terms of the debate as Kant engages it and ultimately brings his critical examination to bear. The basis for the relations of morality, the schooling of reason, and the science of anthropology (conceived as an idea) is laid in the anthropology lectures. Here too we find a nascent identification of the central critical problem, namely the issue of the appropriate principles governing judgment in the various spheres of reason’s engagement of the world – theoretical (cognitive), practical (moral), aesthetic, teleological, and virtuous (ethical). The discussion in the anthropology lectures helps one see how and why solving this problem is, for Kant, of the essence for the perfection of the being of reason and speech. To solve this problem is to address a crucial pedagogical task. As such it fulfills Kant’s own mandate as he expresses it in his notes on pedagogy: it is incumbent on every generation to “work on the plan of a more purposive education,” a task which he further claims is the “greatest and most difficult problem that can be assigned to humankind” (VP 9:445–6).

Kant on civilisation, culture and moralisation

Catherine Wilson

Kant's thoughts and convictions about human beings reflected a number of contemporary developments. This chapter will explore the relationship in the *Lectures on Anthropology* between the title themes and three important aspects of the wider context of the emergence of anthropology as a discipline in the eighteenth century, namely secularisation, animalism and historical pessimism. Kant was a proponent of secularisation, but he rejected animalism and the historical pessimism that often accompanied it, and his views on these three topics can provide an important perspective on the more recondite elements of his philosophy, including his epistemology and his metaphysics of morals. Although it is the *Friedländer Lectures*, either because they offer the most complete record of what Kant was telling his students, or because they demonstrate Kant's particular engagement with the writings of Rousseau in the mid-1770s, that are most useful for this purpose, I shall draw on all the *Lectures* and the *Menschenkunde* to try to situate Kant within some of the most significant debates and concerns of the second half of the eighteenth century.

First, secularisation. The critique of religion in the second half of the century ranged from historical criticism of the Bible and scepticism over the truth of particular doctrines of the Christian religion, the existence of a creator God remaining unquestioned, to a willingness to embrace the radical doctrine that matter was eternal and the powers of nature sufficient to produce all the phenomena.¹ Kant's private religious beliefs, as opposed to his theology, remain shrouded in mystery, but J. F. Abegg reported that Kant told him in private conversation in 1798 that his faith in the

¹ The 'deist' Herman Samuel Reimarus unleashed the *Fragmentenstreit* with his 'Wolfenbüttele Fragments' posthumously and anonymously published as 'Fragments by an Anonymous Writer' by Lessing (1774–7). Hume's *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* were translated into German (1781, Leipzig), as was Holbach's *Système de la nature* (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1783). There followed the *Pantheismustreit* beginning in 1785. Lucretius's atheistic didactic poem *De Rerum Natura* was read throughout the eighteenth century in many editions and translations and was well known and admired by Kant.

existence of God had fallen away gradually since his youth (Abegg (1976), 147, 184). From the earliest *Lectures on Anthropology* of 1772–3 of Collins and Parow, in any case, the expected references to the Creator of man and to the accountability relationship between God and human beings are nowhere in evidence. By the time of the *Friedländer Lectures*, God appears only as an ‘idea’, and Kant quotes Epicurus on this score seemingly in approving fashion (VA-*Friedländer* 25:550, 25:662). Kant’s anthropology not only permits the human being to be understood without reference either to his origins – he may be a creature sprung from the earth, or with ape-like ancestors, or descended from an Adam and Eve created by divine fiat – or to his individual fate in Heaven or Hell, but also requires this understanding. According to the critical philosophy, it is the case both that the human ‘soul’ and morality can be understood in all their essentials in the absence of any knowledge whatsoever about God, the Creation or the life to come, and that even a detailed knowledge of physics, natural history and empirical psychology cannot answer questions about the nature of the soul and morality. This is not to say that the *Lectures*, or for that matter Kant’s contemporaneous or subsequent writings, adopt a Spinozist or Epicurean perspective. Kant employs a strong, if depersonalised, notion of ‘Providence’, as is discussed below.

Second, animalism. The eighteenth century oversaw extensive description of animal morphology and behaviour. It was a period devoted to taxonomy, but hardly ‘mere taxonomy’, insofar as taxonomy was allied to speculation over the origins of life, the origins of the species, and the relation of human beings to the other animals. In addition to making occasional references to the Swede Carl Linnaeus (1707–78) and the Dutch anatomist Peter Camper (1722–89), Kant cites George-Louis Leclerc, the Comte de Buffon (1707–88), whose multi-volume *Histoire naturelle* was one of the most widely read and significant books of the eighteenth century and well known to him.² In the fourteenth volume (1766) of the first French edition of the *Histoire*, Buffon declared,

The form of everything that breathes is nearly the same . . . [E]very animal has the same organisation, the same senses, the same viscera, the same bones, the same flesh. The same motion of the fluids, and the same action in all the solids. In all of them [the anatomist] has found a heart, veins and arteries; the same organs of circulation, respiration, digestion, nutrition and secretion; the same solid structure, erected with the same materials . . . Nutrition,

² The German translation of the first three volumes, with a preface by Albrecht Haller, appeared in 1751, with subsequent volumes appearing from 1771 up to 1782. Kant drew extensively on Buffon’s history of the planet in framing his *Allgemeine Naturgeschichte* of 1755.

expansion and reproduction . . . are general and common to every organized substance; they are eternal and divine; and, far from being effaced or destroyed by time, they are only renewed and rendered more plain and evident. (Buffon (1797), Volume 9, 133–4)

From this appreciation of underlying similitude, shared later by Camper and by Johann von Goethe, Buffon would go on to propose models of descent from a small number of ancestral species, a topic Kant took up in his later writings (Lovejoy (1910); Lovejoy (1911); Wilson (2005)). In his 'Preliminary Discourse' to the *Histoire*, Buffon declared that an important truth followed from the anatomical facts, a truth 'which perhaps humbles man. This truth is that he ought to classify himself with the animals to whom his whole material being connects him'. Kant agreed, but only to an extent, and his *Lectures* repeatedly return to the theme of the implications of the animality of man and the incompleteness of the materialist perspective.

The curiosity of Locke and Leibniz over the boundaries of the human species (Leibniz (1981), 2344) was replaced by questions and sometimes convictions based on a more detailed knowledge of African and South Asian fauna. In 1735, Linnaeus created a sensation by classifying humans amongst the *anthropomorpha*, along with apes, monkey and sloths (Greene (1959), 176). Edward Tyson had much earlier (1699) given a remarkable description of what he called the orang-utan (or 'man of the woods', in fact a chimpanzee) that threw into doubt the line of demarcation between man and ape. Either there were distinct species anatomically intermediate between humans and animals, or else these wild men were fully human and perhaps fully educable, despite their superficial appearance. Rousseau took up the issue in a lengthy footnote to his *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality* of 1755, translated into German the following year. There were two criteria of humanity, he suggested: could these animals 'perfect' themselves by learning to speak and to participate in civil society, and could they interbreed with typical humans?³ Experiments to answer the first question, he noted, have not been made, and to attempt to answer the second would be, he suggested, 'impractical' or perhaps unethical before we established that they were humans (Rousseau (1990), Volume 4, 83; Rousseau (1964), 210). In 1766, in a chapter innocuously and misleadingly titled 'On the Nomenclature of Apes', Buffon addressed the question of this *taxon*. Mind, thought and speech, he declared, belong to man but not

³ A species as defined by Buffon was a community of animals whose pairings could produce fertile offspring. This reproductive criterion had, however, no relation to the intuitive notion of an animal species as a group of animals that look and behave alike. 'A very artificial rule', Henry Home, Lord Kames, called it (Home (2007), Volume 1, 6).

to the orang-utan or the pongo or to other apes and monkeys. Attending only to externals, he suggested, one might well take the ape for a species of human, and the Hottentot for a species of ape, but the interval between the Hottentot and the ape was in fact 'immense' (Buffon (1797), Volume 9, 139).

Kant replicated Buffon's thought in the early *Collins Lectures*: 'Regarding his body, the human being is little different from the animals, and the Hottentot is so near to the Orangutan that if one took into account only the shape in determining the species, one might be doubtful' (VA-*Collins* 25:13–14*).⁴ The human being can be considered, however, from two points of view. 'In the system of nature, the human being belongs to the animal kingdom. However, if I see the human being as part of the world system, he belongs to the rational beings' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1415, 498). In the *Mrongovius Lectures*, Kant gives some attention to questions such as whether humans were originally quadrupedal or bipedal, vegetarian or omnivorous. In the *Menschenkunde*, he decides that it is improbable that human beings once went on four feet, as Rousseau and the Italian physician Moscati maintained, and this for anatomical reasons. Their knees are bent forward, they have short arms relative to their legs, the embryo has calluses only on its feet and not on its hands, and the bone structure of the orang-utan and other apes is different from ours (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1194).

Buffon declared that the human being possesses a 'soul' (*âme*), and that the conflict between human rationality and the 'material animal principle' is ongoing.⁵ By 'soul', it is far from clear that he envisioned an incorporeal, detachable, immortal substance; he may have meant simply that the human being possess certain rational capacities, language and inventiveness. Kant's view expressed in 1775–6 is virtually identical and to that extent conventional:

Human beings can thus be considered twofold, as animals and as intelligences. As animals they are capable of feelings, impressions, and representations, as intelligences they are conscious of themselves, which lies at the basis of all higher powers. As intelligences they have control over their state and over their animality, and this is called Mind [*Geist*]. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:475–6*)

⁴ Here and below, the asterisk indicates that the existing translation has been slightly modified after comparison with the original.

⁵ 'The interior man', says Buffon, 'is double'. He is composed of two opposed principles, one 'a pure light, accompanied with serenity and peace, a salutary source, whence flow science, reason, wisdom', the other 'a false light. . . an impetuous torrent fraught with error and passion' (Buffon (1797), v: 55–6).

The various terms for 'soul', including *Seele* in the *Lectures*, are employed, however, as synonyms for mentality, not for the incorporeal or immortal portion of the human being.⁶

The third important development was the challenge of Enlightenment pessimism. Historians of culture, especially in Scotland, synthesised the available travel literature and ancient and modern accounts of European history to explore the transition from the state of nature to that of civilisation and to compare one with the other. They were interested in the origins of monogamy from an assumed prior state of universal polygamy and what they regarded as the disburdening of women from her slave status in savagery and barbarism.

As Henry Vyverberg has argued by means of examples drawn from Buffon, Rousseau, Voltaire, the Marquis de Sade and Friedrich Melchior Grimm, 'the doctrine of progress was not unresisted in the eighteenth century' (Vyverberg (1958), 75). Along with the 'progressionist' doctrines of Condorcet and the appreciation of the technological developments of eighteenth-century European life, such as carriages, printing, gardening, the polish of manners, the sophistication of poetry and visual art, and the brilliant accomplishments of natural science and mathematics,⁷ came a critique of civilisation and accusations of mediocrity, cruelty and decadence. It was stimulated by the ability to consider human institutions and their creators and participants outside a theological framework, not as guided by Providence but as having been subject to accidents in prehistory. Humans were seen as engaging in perverse group practices, and as made miserable and corrupted by the byproducts of the ascent to civilisation from animality through savagery. The immiseration of the peasantry, the slaughter of native populations as described in the Abbé Raynal's *Histoire des Deux-Indes* (1770) and the brutality of European warfare were understood to follow from the concentration of and search after wealth: the luxury critique of the ancients was revived with the new opulence of colonialism to feed it with examples.

⁶ It will be worthwhile, Kant says, ironically in Collins, 'to consider the mind separated from the body, and to establish, by means of observation, whether the action of the body is necessarily required for thinking. If experience shows us the contrary, then a single deduction from experience will provide us with the most secure proof of the immortality of the soul' (VA-Collins 25:9*). Kant does not return to the topic of immortality in the *Lectures*.

⁷ Henry Home, the cultural historian alluded to by Kant, observes that the carrot, cabbage and turnip were introduced to England only in the time of Henry VIII; the artichoke, apricot and damask rose somewhat later; that knives were first made in England in 1563; pocket watches in 1577, and coaches in 1580 (Home (2007), Volume 1, 109–10).

For Buffon, the animal enjoys the simple, uncomplicated pleasure of a purely material being that knows what suits it, and it does not suffer from human maladies, while '[a]lmost all men lead a life of timidity and contention and the greatest part die of chagrin' (Buffon (1797), Volume 5, 36). The philosopher might well be impressed by an 'absolute savage', such as a boy reared by bears or found in the woods. And 'possibly he might discover in it more mildness, serenity and peace, than in his own; he might also perceive, that virtue belongs more to the savage than to the civilized man, and that vice owes its birth to society' (Buffon (1797), Volume 4, 315).⁸

Rousseau's above-mentioned *Discourse*, which presented a history of humanity drawing heavily on Lucretius's *De Rerum Natura*, is vividly present in the *Friedländer Lectures*. Rousseau, who described the transition from a happy state of small-group living to a miserable state of oppression and frustration, propounded what Kant termed three 'paradoxes': the increasing misery of human beings as a result of the progress of the arts and sciences, the simultaneous development of civilisation and inequality, and the harm done by 'the artificial method in moralising' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1419–20). Rousseau was a divisive writer and in *Mrongovius* he is rather dismissively portrayed as a victim of organic mental illness: 'Rousseau was one of the greatest eccentrics, since he was an extreme misanthrope; at the same time he was a great genius. After his death a large amount of water was found in his head. This could have perhaps been the cause of his eccentricity' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1302*). Yet Kant also portrays Rousseau respectfully as 'the most distinguished' writer on the 'character of man in general' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:675).

Two features of civilisation were regarded by Kant as particularly onerous, and he gives them both sustained attention in the *Friedländer Lectures*. One was the sexual frustration entailed by the European custom of late marriage for men, and the other was warfare. Buffon had brought the topics of puberty and virility into the open (see Fellows (1960), 193), and travel literature and the trade in banned books brought awareness of savage liberalism and European libertinism into juxtaposition with official European morals. Henry Home, Lord Kames, whose *Sketches on Human History* were rapidly translated into German in 1774 and were known to Kant, observed the conflict between the sexual interest of early youth and the need for education, hence delay in marriage. Troubled by this discrepancy, he decided that Providence intended humans to marry early, and that only

⁸ On Buffon and Rousseau, see Fellows (1960).

‘pride and luxury’ delayed their settling down (Home (2007), Volume 1, 265n). Kant agrees that there is a discrepancy between instinctive needs and the requirements of society and that its consequences are lamentable. In the *Menschenkunde* of the early 1780s, he observes that in the state of nature, a human male can nourish and maintain himself already in his tenth year, and that by his sixteenth he can propagate his kind and also maintain and defend wife and children. In civilisation, with the multiplication of economic needs, marriage is delayed until age thirty (*Menschenkunde* 25:1196). This leads to fierce conflict between nature and culture and to suffering and ‘vice’ – by which Kant presumably understands masturbation, prostitution, female unchastity and infanticide. Further, sexual tension and conflict are exacerbated in civilisation because of the artifice that all writers seem to agree is absent in animal and savage life: love.

Through marriage, Kant explains to his students, according to Friedländer’s notes, a woman becomes free (presumably to pursue adulterous relationships under cover), while a man loses his freedom (VA-Friedländer 25:7124). In civilisation, but not in the animal world or in savagery, women adorn themselves alluringly to rouse the imaginations and appetites of men. They compete with one another and appear to be differentiated one from another. This leads to adultery (VA-Friedländer 25:687) and to the hypocrisy of gallantry. For, at the same time, women feign a coldness and indifference to sex that they do not feel, enabling them to manipulate and dominate men. Kant believes they do so since they would otherwise be exploited, and since men ‘demand this refusal and coldness of the woman’. Gratification is greater ‘when the refusing party yields’ (VA-Friedländer 25:709–10).

The sex drive is not, however, to be condemned. It is ‘moral fantasy . . . to consider sexual desire as improper’ (VA-Mrongovius 25:1360*, reading ‘desire’ for *Neigung*). The contempt for sex is like contempt for the preservation of one’s life; it involves the attempt to raise oneself above humanity. Even love is not to be scorned. In a less cynical spirit than Buffon and Rousseau, who declared that ‘moral love’ is a fraud and only ‘physical love’ authentic,⁹ Kant declares his appreciation for the power of the imagination, which, he thinks, reduces the crudity of the sexual instinct. But the fundamental conflict between sexual desire and the economic requirements of civilisation is, Kant thinks, simply insoluble (VA-Friedländer 25:683). The cultural and moral destiny of man – his overcoming of

⁹ On love in Buffon and Rousseau, see Fellows (1960), 193. ‘Among the many observations expressed by Buffon on the subject of love is one which is supposed to have deeply shocked Mme de Pompadour: “Il n’y a que le physique de cette passion qui soit bon.”’

crudity and vice, the ennobling of his sentiments, and cultivation of beauty – require precisely that he fight against his animal endowment. ‘On this side [sex], nature has determined us for animality, but on the other side we are determined for civil order, namely with regard to the perfection of humanity. Now, through the civil order, we must do violence to the natural state.’ Luxury and refinement are not corruptions of our innocence; on the contrary, they serve to ‘weaken [the force] of our animality’ (VA-*Friedländer* 25:684*).

The other great trouble under civilisation, warfare waged by sovereign nations, is also a central preoccupation of Kant’s. On this topic, he presents himself in a deeply ambiguous way. Warfare was strongly condemned by Bernard de Mandeville, the Abbé St Pierre, Buffon, Voltaire, and the Encyclopedist Louis de Joucourt; Kant, by contrast, rejects the pacifist sentiments and initiatives of his own time, not as utopian – for he looks forward to a properly policed world without nationalistic aggression – but as premature. It is here that his understanding of Nature as a teleological force, as embracing processes above and beyond those observed in Newtonian mechanics and even in the development of individual living organisms, comes to the fore.

At present, Kant believes, Europeans are in an unhappy, intermediate state. In developing the arts and sciences and entering an age of hierarchy and luxury, they have lost the simple happiness of the animal and the savage, and they suffer under the miseries of civilisation. However, they have not yet attained the perfection of civil society that is possible for the future. Nor have they attained the moral virtue of which they are capable in principle (VA-*Friedländer* 25:690). The animal life ruled by instinct is good because the species fulfil their functions capably. The human life in which freedom is combined with reason is also good. But animality combined with freedom, as in the savage or partially civilised condition of man, is evil (VA-*Pillau* 25:844). Our animality is the part of us that maintains the life of the species, but we no longer need the passions – especially fear and anger – that were formerly required in the state of nature for our survival. They must be suppressed and this is possible, for ‘Nature did not give us these passions, but only the underlying potentials [*Anlagen*] for them’ (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1343*).

Kant’s view of natural man ‘mistrustful, violent, and hostile toward his own kind’ (VA-*Friedländer* 25:678) goes far beyond what is to be found in St Augustine, Hobbes or La Rochefoucauld. It is orthogonal to that of the moral sense or native endowment school of Hutcheson, Shaftesbury and

Adam Smith, who ascribe sympathy and benevolent motives to human beings antecedent to cultural indoctrination. Kant appears unimpressed by Rousseau's assertion that pity was a basic emotion of early man, and by the suggestion of Buffon that the perfect savage might be a mild creature. Benevolence appears as a duty in Kant's moral philosophy, but, whether it is considered as a natural, psychological trait or as one fostered by civilisation, it is wavering, undependable and often hypocritical (VA-Friedländer 25:504–5).

The basic capacities and drives of the human considered as an animal, and shared with the animals, include the drive for self-preservation (VA-Friedländer 25:585); frugality (VA-Friedländer 25:616–17); the sexual drive; dexterity; and pugnacity and its companion trait, xenophobia (VA-Friedländer 25:678). Animality (rather than Adam's fall and the transmission of original sin) is, for Kant, the source of the 'evil' in man. Somewhat offhandedly, he asks his class:

Among the animals, and among all beings, what [kind of] a character does [the human being] have? How much good and how much evil is in him? Does he contain a source for evil, or for good, in himself? In the first place, the human being must be characterized as an animal. Linnaeus says that, on long reflection, he finds nothing special about the human being as an animal; hence he must add him to the class of the apes. If one wanted to go on to infer his character from this, it would be unfortunate, for apes are very malevolent and deceitful animals. (VA-Friedländer 25:675*)

The human being considered as animal is not a predator; he does not have the claws and jaws of the pure carnivore or the propensity for mauling, and he lacks the 'immediate appetite for blood'. When it comes to diet, he is more likely a vegetarian or, given his dentition and his stomach, a semi-vegetarian. But 'with respect to his own species', when not under the coercion of civilisation, he is indeed a beast of prey. On the basis of introspection, Kant thinks, everyone can agree that a man who found himself on a desert island and who believed himself for a long time to be alone would be untroubled. But

he would become terrified if he became aware that there was another human being, for now he would no longer be perfectly safe, now he might have an enemy who would be more dangerous for him than any wild animal, since he could in fact save himself from them and outwit them, but not the human being; for this one can stalk him, observe all his behaviour, obstruct him, and be dangerous for him in every respect. (VA-Friedländer 25:678*)

Man is not a herd or hive animal, nor is he a solitary animal. He has a 'propensity towards society', but only on account of his needs and not through any natural affection for his kind (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1416). Humans come to tolerate one another's presence only after they discover they have the same needs. '[H]owever, even then one cannot fully trust the other; one does not know for sure that the other is not plotting against one' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:678*).

Misanthropy is not, however, warranted, for the animalistic traits Kant describes are in his view providential. They are ladders to the perfection of civil society that can eventually be thrown away. Nature does nothing in vain and 'Nature's [original] purpose [for humans] was . . . civil society' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:690). Scarcity and hardship rouse humans from their natural indolence and provoke them to develop their skills. However, 'they do not serve fully for the development of talents'. This requires human evil – 'animality combined with freedom' (VA-*Pillau* 25:844). In the *Friedländer Lectures*, Kant's adaptationism – his view that what we observe universally must have, if we can see no immediate cause for it, a hidden purpose – comes to the fore:¹⁰

Since, as it is, [human malevolence] belongs to the universal order of Nature, although it immediately aims at something evil, it must indirectly have a purpose. It is a universal rule which one must observe, and which is deeply philosophical, that one must always search for the purpose and intent of anything which exists universally in nature. . . . for Nature will not produce such a universal order in vain. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:679)

Unlike the other animals, humans are intended by Providence (here, unusually, *Gott*) to become ubiquitous and to develop culture. Their nastiness is a precondition for both, and Kant here avails himself of the paradox of social-good-through-individual-evil invented by Mandeville, who showed how vice produces (economic) virtue (Mandeville (1714)).¹¹ The transition from hunting and gathering to agriculture, as Kames and others knew, resulted in the tremendous growth of populations, and their numerousness and pugnacity, along with scarcity, drove, and continue to drive, humans to the far corners of the earth. When they must live together, they develop both property and theft, law and criminality, the virtues of civilisation along with its vices:

¹⁰ Compare his argument in the *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* regarding the purpose of the otherwise inexplicable endowment of human reason at A 4:395.

¹¹ This text appears to have been translated as *Anti-Shaftesbury, oder die Entlarvte Eitelkeit der Selbstliebe und Ruhmsucht* (1761), but I have not been able to verify that it is the same work. See Marquard (1981) on the *bonum-durch-malum* principal in Kant.

From [the maliciousness of human nature] arise the development of talents, the concepts of justice and morality, and the development of the greatest perfection of which people are capable . . . [T]he arts emerge from this; true, needs grow, yet working these out proves to be a credit to human beings. The human being refines himself with regard to taste, prosperity and propriety. All these perfections emerged from the maliciousness of the human spirit [*Gemüth*], which first produced civil constraint. (VA-Friedländer 25:680*)

Laziness, cowardice and secretiveness have good consequences; labour and industry are motivated by the prospect of rest, and our capacity for industry requires a counterweight to prevent exhaustion. Cowardice protects us from rash behaviour and dissimulation and hypocrisy from offending others (VA-Mrongovius 25:1420–1).

Kant agrees with Rousseau that in the state of nature the human being lives like an animal, more happily and more innocently (VA-Friedländer 25:684–5). He has no concept of social honour, rank, fine dress, food or court manners, and is spared the effort. He risks losing his life to another individual, but he does not have to join the army or face enemy soldiers. ‘The wars of the savages are only a temporary storm; by contrast ours are far more terrible and ruthless, and even peace is a constant armament for war, so that the preservation and protection of life cost more effort and work than life is worth’ (VA-Friedländer 25:686–7). However, the happiness and innocence of the savage are ‘negative’. The Arcadian life of the shepherd or of the Tahitians makes them no more estimable than any animal species (VA-Mrongovius 25:1422). The myth of the Fall of Adam is illustrative, Kant thinks. Adam ‘misused his reason’ because all his wants were fulfilled in the Garden. He was like a spoiled child (VA-Pillau 25:844). There is neither vice nor virtue in the state of nature. The human being has not won his happiness and does not maintain it against the threat of misery, nor does he maintain his innocence against the threat of corruption:

In the civil state, the human being sacrifices many of the natural advantages, he sacrifices his freedom in many ways, his carefreeness to achieve his comforts; the contentment which arises from the lack of knowledge of greater needs, a large portion of his health through overexertion of his powers, and through the wasting away of his life, and through grief, worry, and effort. He becomes subject to the temptation of vices, he develops desires from the knowledge of needs, which seduce him into many passions, he comes to know the moral law, and [at the same time] to feel the incentive to ignore his duties, and since his capabilities have been aroused, evil will grow in just the same way as will the good . . . Accordingly, in the civil state, the human being is not as virtuous and happy as in the natural one. (VA-Friedländer 25:688–9*)

Kant admits that as soon as savages who have been 'lured into the civil state' as servants are given the opportunity, they choose nature and their freedom (VA-*Friedländer* 25:687). But he knows that Rousseau himself did not think we 'should all head for the woods' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:689); he wanted, rather, to perfect the civil constitution and to show how it could be united with nature (VA-*Friedländer* 25:684).¹² Where nature can only make us 'negatively' happy and good, the civil state can make us positively happy and virtuous. This positive happiness will not be the personal, individual happiness enjoyed by the savage. The civil state produces general happiness and virtue through coercion, through law and punishment, by means of 'parents, of the circumstances of making a living, of propriety, of honour' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:690). These are spurs to 'industry and diligence' that overcome the human being's natural laziness and force him to furnish goods to others.

Where Henry Home thought that the late eighteenth century was a happy intermediate state between savagery and decadence, Kant finds the intermediate state rather miserable. We have lost the happiness and innocence of the state of nature but have not yet realised the perfection of civil society, which will be 'a society of equal beings' in which all practical conditions are met (VA-*Friedländer* 25:690). Rousseau 'shows in general that in us lie the germs for cultivation toward our vocation; and we have need of a civil constitution on this account, in order to fulfil the end of nature' (VA-*Pillau* 25:847). 'Such a [political] state still does not in fact exist, yet by means of many revolutions which still must take place, it is to be hoped for.' If it does not come about, 'then we have still lost more than we have gained' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:692*). Kant seems to endorse the claim he ascribes to Rousseau, namely that 'if we stop with the civil constitution we have now, then it would be better to return to the estate of wildness' (VA-*Pillau* 25:847).

Kant now ponders whether the perfection of the civil state should come from the top down, starting with the establishment of a perfect constitution, or whether effort should be directed towards perfecting individuals through education. Like Rousseau, he opts for the latter, for the rulers are currently educated by 'corrupted persons' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:696). Some

¹² Kant does not acknowledge the Rousseau of the *Social Contract*, who argues that, under civilisation, 'The faculties [of the human being] are exercised and developed, his ideas broadened, his feelings ennobled, and his whole soul is elevated to such a point that if the abuses of his new condition did not often degrade him beneath the condition he left, he ought ceaselessly to bless the happy moment that tore him away from it forever, and that changed him from a stupid, limited animal into an intelligent being and a man' (Rousseau (1990), Volume 4, 141; Rousseau (1964), Volume 3, 364).

of the ills of his age, besides bad education, cited by Kant are the volition of kings, the absence of utility in the sciences, and the pre-eminence of taste and fashion over real worth. 'To date we are only refined and polished, but we lack what constitutes a good citizen. As for morality, we can say that we have not gotten very far' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1427). But human beings have managed to produce by themselves the refinements of culture in the form of manners, cleanliness, 'taste, modesty, refinement, courtesy, and decorum' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:692), and they can presumably lift themselves out of their moral laxness as well.

Civil society enforces moral constraint through the judgment of others. This, Kant says, is more effective in producing 'lived morality' than is religion. It is social judgment that leads people to kill themselves rather than suffer to disgrace in the eyes of others (VA-*Friedländer* 25:694). The force of reputation requires further development, however, as it does not currently operate to the same extent as social and legal coercions. Kant envisions a society in which people have come to shun the corrupt and to evaluate those who seek office by their character rather than by conduct or skill (VA-*Friedländer* 25:693). Yet, declaring his rejection of the view that the judgment of our fellows, an external constraint, is and ought to be the main incentive to virtue, Kant insists that moral development requires as well the development of individual conscience, which is in most cases 'opiated':

If [conscience] were cultivated, then this constraint, since it is an inner one, would be the strongest, and then nothing more would be needed. We actually have a predisposition for this in us [given to us] by Providence, insofar as everyone judges himself, and judges others around him as well. Therefore Providence has really made us judges, only we do not express our moral judgments, because no moral establishment has as yet been instituted. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:693*)

Children ought to be brought up to feel the same inner repulsion to lies as they do to spiders, merely by observing the shudder of their nurse (VA-*Friedländer* 25:695). Kant is somewhat unclear about the role of religion in developing conscience. 'Conscience is the deity's vicar.' But morality ought not to depend on whether Heaven and Hell exist outside the world (VA-*Friedländer* 25:695).

History, for Kant is not a long story of the Fall and the wait for a Redeemer. Nor is it the subject of the degeneration narratives of the classical theorists of the golden age and of the Rousseau of the *Discourses*. Nor is history, as Pierre Bayle suggested, nothing but 'a collection of the

crimes and misfortunes of mankind', simply one sanguinary episode after another (Bayle (1738), 7:400). History, for Kant, is on a one-way, upwards trajectory, despite appearances. In this regard, there are similarities with and differences to the Leibnizian theodicy. Leibniz's 'static' defense of the goodness of the world, based largely on the beauty of physics and the intricacy and beauty of organisms, together with his claim that evil is such in appearance only, are left behind. Evil, one might say, is scientifically real for Kant, rooted in our species-nature. Kant's version of the good-world doctrine is dynamic, but to this extent it draws on the Leibnizian metaphors of growth and unfolding, updated with eighteenth-century life science, especially embryology.

Kant's references to *Keime* and *Analagen* – seeds and predispositions – and to the *Vorsicht* or *Vorsehung* – Providence – that has implanted them resurface in his published essays. The former afford a middle route between monogenesis and polygenesis. Africans, Asians, Americans and Europeans are all of the same interbreeding species, but different racial characteristics existing *in potentia* are elicited by different environments (VvRM 2:427–44). Mental and moral characteristics similarly exist *in potentia* and can be developed:

Just as an embryo must become a man, so must everything rise up to its full perfection. Innate to human nature are germs which develop and which can achieve the perfection for which they are determined. . . . Should one who has seen a savage Indian or Greenlander really believe that there is a germ innate to him to become a Parisian man of fashion just as much as anyone else? He has, however, the same germs as a civilized human being, only they are not yet developed. We equally have reason to believe that there are germs for greater perfection innate to human nature, which could well be developed, and [that] humanity must achieve the degree of perfection for which it is determined, and for which it has the germs within itself, and [that] it will be transported into the condition which is the best possible. (VA-Friedländer 25:694*)

The perfection of civil society may be a long time in coming, but the advances of the past thousand years indicate, Kant says, that 'great changes are to be hoped for' (VA-Friedländer 25:694). Ideally, there will be an end to war, the formation of a league of nations to decide all disputes, and the diversion of military resources to social improvement (VA-Friedländer 25:696). But are political utopia and the perfection of manners, taste, moral judgment and conscience an empirically well-founded hope, an obligatory hope or a mere hope? Kant does not differentiate clearly between these possibilities.

Despite his statement in *Friedländer Lectures* that the Indian and the Greenlander have the same seeds of the urban dandy as every other human being, Kant expressed the view in 1772 that there would not be much further development outside Europe. The native Americans will not develop. They will simply 'die out'; only a twentieth part of the American population remains,¹³ and while they have been exploited by Europeans, Kant admits, this is not the cause of their decline. The Negroes will not develop either. The Chinese and Indians will not develop further than they have, for although they have art and 'an analogue to science', they 'lack spirit'. The Greeks, however, were paradigms of development, and Germany has received their spirit (VA-*Pillau* 25:843). Kant's views are no different ten years later. The Americans lack affect, passion and culture, and are lazy. As for the Negro race,

one could say, [it] is exactly the opposite of the American; they are full of affect and passion, very lively, talkative and vain. They acquire culture, but only a culture of slaves; that is, they allow themselves to be trained. They have many incentives, are also sensitive, afraid of beatings, and also do many things out of honor. (*Menschenkunde* 25:1187)

The Chinese and Indians are also going nowhere. Kant has a more difficult time to show why the Asians will not develop, insofar as Asian government and manufacture were recognised in his time as superior to European. Kant addresses this problem in 1781–2, by dividing Asians into Hindus, who lack the capacity for abstraction and are not going anywhere, and the white 'Orientals' (*Menschenkunde* 25:1187–8). 'The white race', by contrast, 'contains all incentives and talents in itself' (*Menschenkunde* 25:1188), and it will presumably spearhead the drive to cultural and moral perfection.¹⁴

Kant's racism is accordingly less than incidental to his philosophy, though curiously at odds with his universal *Keime* theory. The underlying thought, if there is one, might be that if there were no purpose to the enslavement and extermination of certain races, Providence would not favour the spread and domination of the Europeans. The same problem affects Kant's view of women. Women and Africans are described in similar terms, as talkative, vain, sensitive and responsive to honour (VA-*Friedländer* 25:543; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1187). Women are necessary – nature cannot

¹³ Smallpox was largely responsible for the devastation of American populations; see Diamond (1999), 192–5.

¹⁴ Kleingeld (2007) argues that, in the 1790s, Kant radically revised his views on race. In *Perpetual Peace* (1795) Kant decries the subjugation of native populations by military means and its attendant evils. But the corresponding obligation of other regions to be 'hospitable' to Europeans is consistent with belief in a teleology of nature that would end with European-led pacification and governance.

extinguish them as the weaker parties – but they cannot develop either. The *Friedländer Lectures* explain that women do not act on principle but for reasons of social status. They are not oriented to the future and the purposes of things and therefore cannot plan or manage their affairs. They must keep up appearances because of their socio-economic dependency and therefore they cannot make the sacrifices morality requires (VA-*Friedländer* 25:719–22).¹⁵ ‘Women are such that they cannot do without a leader; just as they cannot even go out on the street without a guide, they also need one in all their affairs’ (VA-*Friedländer* 25:543*). Though aimless themselves, they generate ongoing conflict: ‘The female temperament occasions strife and war’, punctuated by reconciliation and unity (VA-*Friedländer* 25:714). The battle of the sexes seems to hold out no prospect for perpetual peace.

In this regard, Kant stands apart from a number of his contemporaries, who considered women and non-Europeans candidates for development and who took social progress to imply the broadening of entitlements and benefits. Condorcet was soon to declare that women were entitled to citizenship (Condorcet (1790)). Kant’s friend Theodor von Hippel wrote a popular tract defending the social equality of women (Hippel (1774)). Home questioned whether there was really an inferiority in the understanding of the Negroes, suggesting that its appearance might be ‘occasioned by their condition’. The cultivation of the female mind, he said, ‘would add greatly to the happiness of the males and still more to the females’ (Home (2007), Volume 1, 301). Where Kant takes it as a given that human beings are kind to young women but not to old ones (VA-*Friedländer* 25:619), Home sees this as a problem. With education and the employment of the latter’s mental faculties, ‘The respect of men for women would then continue into old age when beauty is lost . . . Mutual esteem would be to each a school of urbanity’ (Home (2007), Volume 1, 302).

Kant is often regarded as a philosopher for whom autonomy and freedom are central concepts. For the modern reader, ‘autonomy’ connotes an individual’s right to determine the course of their own lives and the responsibility to live morally for reasons independent of the forces of social and legal coercion and empty promises of punishment and reward in the afterlife. Autonomy is not, however, emphasised in the *Lectures on Anthropology*.¹⁶

¹⁵ See Brandt’s description (Brandt 1999) of Kant’s misogyny as ‘untameable’ and propagated to students for a quarter of a century.

¹⁶ ‘Spontaneity’ is mentioned only once, though as a fundamental attribute of the concept of the self. ‘Spontaneity also results from it [the concept], for when I say, I act, I am not moved’ (VA-*Friedländer* 25:473).

The notion that 'freedom' should not be considered a metaphysical attribute of all persons, but consists in freedom of movement and freedom from coercion by others, originates with Hobbes (who of course allows for coercion by agreement) and Locke. This 'embodied' notion of freedom was amplified by the new animalism and the concerns over colonial slavery. Rousseau writes dramatically of the basic desire of human and nonhuman animals to be free in this sense:

when I see Animals born free and despising captivity break their heads against the bars of their prison; when I see multitudes of entirely naked savages scorn European voluptuousness and endure hunger, fire, the sword and death, to preserve only their independence, I feel it does not behove Slaves to reason about liberty. (Rousseau (1990), Volume 4, 57; Rousseau (1964), 181)

The docility of civilised nations, he says, does not prove 'the natural disposition of mankind for or against slavery'; we should rather take note of 'the prodigious efforts of every free people to save itself from oppression' (ibid.). As Buffon says, in considering the domesticated animal, 'We must separate what is natural for them from what they are made to do; and never confound the animal with the slave, the beast of burden with the creature of God' (Buffon (1797), Volume 5, 755)

Kant agrees. 'Most animals have an insurmountable propensity toward freedom . . . The enslaved human being will become degraded. but once freed, he will quickly help himself up' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1354). 'He will', Kant assures us, 'surely learn to use his powers, just as someone who is bound cannot walk so long as he is bound, yet when released is able to walk' (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1300). Yet while Kant professes the same antipathy as Rousseau to the condition of slavery, his rejection of the thesis of natural goodness is so powerful that his call for a release from the condition of immaturity is limited by his thesis that man, in his present condition and unlike the animals, needs a master (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1419; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1200). The uncontrolled passions of 'the rabble' mean that coercion is absolutely required. 'In the civil condition man grows straight like the tree in the forest because he is hemmed in on all sides and because other trees rob it of sun and branches.' Freedom without laws and force is the freedom of savages and nomads (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1425).

Kant recognises that the need for coercion is problematic. The inclination to dominate which so frequently produces actual domination is itself a product of evil wills:

The mania for dominance is found in everyone. The stronger always oppresses the weaker if he can do so. We find that everywhere in history. Even children possess it. For they dominate animals. It is a lot of trouble for the master and where does this drive in humans come from? From love of freedom. We are worried that the other might begin to dominate us and that we might lose our freedom; for that reason we try to assure our safety [*spielen wir das sicherste*] and we ourselves dominate. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1358*)

Who, then, will suffer himself to be mastered and who will master the masters?

What, then, should we make of Kant with regard to his views on culture, civilisation and moralisation? And what light do the *Lectures* throw on Kant's moral philosophy? The views Kant expressed over twenty-five years of lecturing are generally consistent with the challenges to Rousseau and Herder as proponents of natural man in Kant's later essays (see Zammito (2002); Wilson (1998)), while the extended meditations on the need for a transcendence both of animality and of mere social convention throw light on Kant's demand for metaphysical foundations for morality. Alas, however, the *Lectures* have little to say about the essential dignity of human beings, their intrinsic equality as members of a single species, and the irrelevance to their worth of their social roles and economic circumstances. Not only does Kant fail to mention the duty of benevolence, he also regards a concern for universal welfare (*Wohllwollen gegen das ganze menschliche Geschlecht*) as a harmful delusion. Of the critics of civilisation he says, 'Such enthusiasts are not malicious people, but they are touched with principles of benevolence toward the entire human race, and since they cannot find such, they become misanthropes, for example, Rousseau, and are taken to be absurd' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:530). It is unnerving to find Kant himself lecturing his students year after year on their cruelty, hypocrisy, and irrationality. The human being, he informs them, is full of 'jealousy, mistrust, violence, propensity for enmity against those outside the family' (VA-*Friedländer* 25:679). What is repeatedly stressed in the *Lectures* is the need for discipline, control, coercion (*Zwang*). This is a strange presentation for an opponent of misanthropy, and it far exceeds anything to be met with in Hobbes who, almost 150 years earlier, was excoriated on the basis of a very few lines regarding the tendencies of natural man.

It might be argued that, from the perspective of Kant's system as a whole, these vacancies and amplifications are deliberate. The metaphysics of morals is the complement of anthropology and not continuous with it. Through elaborate and essentially unprecedented strategies of philosophical argumentation, Kant demands recognition of non-empirical normative

posits, such as free will and a capacity to recognise and respond to the good, which are necessary precisely because the empirical study of man provides almost no hint of their existence. However, the picture is more complicated. It is difficult fully to concur with Kant's argument, emphasised in the *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* (G 4:395–6; see Wood (2000)), that personal happiness, though a natural aim, does not matter where morality is concerned and is best left to animals and savages. The universalisation test for moral permissibility appears less a product of a concern for the well-being of all than a form of much-needed *Zwang* for inconstant man.

The eighteenth century's 'torrent of tears' for humanity (Fusil (1930), 176), which washes over the writings of Rousseau, Diderot, Raynal and the French Encyclopedists, is not to be found in Kant. 'Crying is decidedly womanish' (VA-Friedländer 25:602). The universal satisfaction of needs as the aim of cultural development does not come high on Kant's list. One cannot, he says, think of a civil constitution without inequality (VA-Mrongovius 25:1419). The pacifism of the Encyclopedists and of the Abbé St Pierre, with his detailed proposals for a pan-European police force in place of national armies, eventually to be extended across the globe, was dealt a hard setback in Kant's deferral of perpetual peace to a future perhaps thousands of years away, to which Providence would see.

By way of charitable interpretation it is important to remember what Kant was striving to accomplish and what he felt he was up against. He entered into the study of anthropology and applied himself to the dissemination of his views amongst the young with several aims in mind. One aim was simply to contribute to the articulation, so popular in the second half of the eighteenth century, of taxonomies and differentiations – races, characters, sexes, stages of humanity. A second aim was to address the question of the extent to which the human being is understandable as an animal like any other whose behaviour is driven by instincts and external incentives, and to what extent this being is understandable as one that has acquired power over its instincts and temptations and can exercise non-animal capabilities. A third aim was to contribute to the formation of a secular image of human beings. Their existence, moral motivation and ultimate destiny, Kant wanted to show, are fully conceivable without reference to a divinity with personal characteristics, including moral standards and demands, and without reference to the natural goodness of man as a substitute for a divinity. Rousseau declared, 'It would be sad for us to agree that this distinctive and almost unlimited faculty [perfectibility] is the source of all man's misfortunes' (Rousseau (1990), Volume 4, 26; Rousseau

(1964), 142). In reply to Rousseau, Kant proposed his own paradoxes: the cruelty of human beings will bring about their civil perfection through discipline and coercion, and the seeds of moral conscience lie sleeping in the malevolent and passionate animal, waiting to be prodded from dormancy into growth.

Cosmopolitical unity: the final destiny of the human species

Robert B. Loudon

That there is a cosmopolitical predisposition [*eine cosmopolitische Anlage*] in the human species, even with all the wars, which gradually in the course of political matters wins the upper hand over the selfish predispositions of people.

(Marginal note in Kant's *Handschrift* for *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* 7:412)

From the mid-1770s onward and toward the very end of his presentation, we find a chapter on the character of the human species as a whole in all but one of Kant's *Lectures on Anthropology*.¹ What are Kant's main points in this important concluding discussion? How did his thinking on this topic develop, and what influenced it? What should we today make of his bold claims, particularly as regards humanity's alleged predisposition toward "cosmopolitical unity" (see A 7:333)? These are the questions that I wish to address in what follows.

Friedländer (1775–6) is the earliest anthropology transcription to include a chapter on the character of the human species.² While it is not the final

An earlier version of this chapter was presented as an invited lecture at the xiv Colóquio Kant da UNICAMP in Campinas, Brazil, in August 2012. I would like to thank my hosts Andrea Faggion and José Oscar de Almeida Marques for their very generous invitation, audience members for their insightful questions, and Alexandre Hahn for his work on the Portuguese translation of my essay. Thanks also to Georg Cavallar, for his helpful comments on an earlier draft.

¹ VA-*Busolt* (1788–9), the last of the transcriptions included in Academy Volume 25, is the exception. But the editors note that this text "breaks off" in the chapter entitled "On the Characteristic of the Person" (VA-*Busolt* 25:1531n6), and in the extremely short "Doctrine of Method" chapter that precedes it the transcriber notes that the character of the human being divides into "the character of the person, of sex, of a people, and finally the character of the species" (VA-*Busolt* 25:1530). We can infer from this remark that *Busolt* too, if it had not broken off, would have ended with a chapter on the character of the human species.

² However, Kant's earlier *Lectures on Physical Geography*, which form part of the background for his *Lectures on Anthropology*, also include discussions about human beings. For instance, *Holstein* (1757–9), the earliest of the published geography lectures, includes a section called "Of the Human Being" (V-PG 26:85–102), as does the better-known version of the lectures edited by Rink (PG 9:311–20 – the two sections are virtually identical). But Kant's discussions of human beings in

chapter of the manuscript,³ “On the Character of Humanity in General” (25:675–97), at twenty-two Academy pages, is also Kant’s longest discussion of this topic. Many important themes connected to the character and destiny of the human species are discussed in *Friedländer*, but let us start with our focal point, cosmopolitics. Toward the very end of the chapter, Kant states:

In order, however, that all wars would not be necessary, a league of nations [*Völkerbund*] would thus have to arise, where all nations [*alle Völker*] constituted a universal senate through their delegates, [where] all disputes of nations would have to be decided, and this judgment would have to be executed through the power of the nations [*Macht der Völker*]; then the nations would also be subject to one forum [*foro*] and one civil constraint. This senate of nations would be the most enlightened that the world has ever seen. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:696)

This passage is noteworthy in part because it depicts a stronger version of nature’s “*hidden plan*,” viz. the bringing about of “a universal *cosmopolitan condition* [*ein allgemeiner weltbürgerlicher Zustand*]” (Idea 8:27, 28, original emphasis), than one finds later in Kant’s most famous text on this topic, *Toward Perpetual Peace* (1795). In the latter work Kant offers no solid details concerning exactly how states are to resolve their disagreements with each other, whereas in *Friedländer* – in a manner reminiscent of Saint-Pierre’s call for a “permanent machinery for arbitration” and a union that would possess sufficient collective force to restrain any “party wishing to renege on his promise” (Williams (1999), 357, 359; see also Loudén (2007b), 93–106) – Kant explicitly advocates a senate of nations creating a forum with sufficient *Macht* to enforce its decisions. Also, the political model sketched by Kant in the *Friedländer Lectures* is clearly a universal one requiring the membership of *alle Völker*, whereas in *Perpetual Peace* Kant envisions only a voluntary league limited to republics, albeit one that

the Geography Lectures focus primarily on physical characteristics allegedly influenced by climate (see, e.g., V-PG 26:90, PG 9:314), while those in the anthropology lectures range over biology, history, politics, morality, international law, religion, and more. Nevertheless, as I have argued elsewhere (Loudén (2011), 124–8), in the end it is difficult to draw a bright, clear line between Kant’s discussions of human beings in the geography and anthropology lectures. *Menschenkunde* (1781–2), for instance, includes a notorious chapter entitled “There are Four Races on Earth; These Are” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1187–8), and yet later in the same transcription Kant remarks that the “difference of races” is a topic “whose special character belongs to physical geography” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1195; cf. A 7:120).

³ Part of the explanation here concerns Kant’s intense but short-lived interest in Basedow’s Philanthropin, an educational experiment that began in 1774 – i.e. one year before the *Friedländer* lecture was delivered. *Friedländer* is the only anthropology transcription to conclude with a chapter called “On Education” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:722–8).

he predicts “should gradually extend over all states” (EF 8:356; cf. 354). Although Kant does not explicitly mention Saint-Pierre in *Friedländer*,⁴ it is certain that he was familiar with Saint-Pierre’s *Plan for Perpetual Peace in Europe* by this time. For in the *Kaehler* lecture on moral philosophy (1774–5), Kant states, “The Abbe de Saint-Pierre’s proposal for a general senate of nations [*allgemeinen VolkerSenat*] would, if carried out, be the moment at which the human race would take a great step towards perfection” (Kant (2004), 366; cf. VMo-Collins 27:470). However, an even stronger influence on Kant’s thinking about cosmopolitanism during the mid-1770s was the educational reformer Johann Bernhard Basedow (1724–90). The final chapter in *Friedländer* is entitled “On Education,” and in it Basedow’s Philanthropin Institute, established in Dessau in 1774, is declared to be “the greatest phenomenon which has appeared in this century for the improvement of the perfection of humanity” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:722–3). Basedow, a cosmopolitan educational reformer who taught his students to become “true citizens of our world” (Basedow (1776), 15), strongly influenced Kant’s own belief that the proper “design for a plan of education must be cosmopolitical [*kosmopolitisch*]” and that teachers must instill “cosmopolitan dispositions” (*weltbürgerliche Gesinnungen*) in their students (VP 9:448, 499).

But Basedow’s educational cosmopolitanism (and he is by no means the only example of this tendency) was not directly political. He did not have an international political agenda; he did not advocate a world-political ideal. He was, so to speak, cosmopolitan but not cosmopolitical.⁵ Kant’s anthropological conception of the character and destiny of the human species, even in the relatively early, Basedow-influenced *Friedländer* transcription, definitely includes a strong political component. What are central elements of this conception, and how do they jointly support nature’s ultimate aim, cosmopolitical unity?

I. Nature’s purposes

Anchoring Kant’s anthropological inquiry into the character and destiny of the human species is his teleological perspective on nature as a whole. All natural organisms, humans most definitely included, are to be understood

⁴ In the *Lectures on Anthropology*, Saint-Pierre’s name first occurs in the *Pillau* transcription of 1777–8 (VA-*Pillau* 25:764, 767).

⁵ For further discussion of the distinction between cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitics, see Kleingeld (2012), esp. 38–9. For discussion of Basedow’s influence on Kant, see Loudon (2012) and Cavallar (2012).

as having inherent goals and purposes. Nothing in nature “is in vain, purposeless, or to be ascribed to a blind mechanism of nature” (KU 5:376; cf. 379). In the *Anthropology Lectures* and related writings on human nature, we find this assertion repeatedly. For instance, in *Friedländer* Kant stresses the importance to his audience of “a universal rule which one must observe, and which is very philosophical, that one must always search for the end and intent [*den Zweck und die Absicht*] of something which exists universally in nature” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:679). And nine years later, in *Mrongovius* (1784–5): “Every creature reaches its destiny in the world, i.e., reaches the time in which all of its natural predispositions are developed and come to maturity” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1417–18). In the published text of the *Anthropology* this thought is echoed in Kant’s remark that “one can assume as a principle that nature wants every creature to reach its destiny through the appropriate development of all predispositions of its nature” (A 7:329).

Kant’s double assumption that (1) all biological creatures have inherent purposes and (2) these purposes will eventually be realized (“in nature everything is designed to achieve its greatest possible perfection” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:694)) also provides a major portion of the “guiding thread” in Kant’s writings on the philosophy of history.⁶ For instance, the first proposition in *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim* reads: “All natural predispositions of a creature are determined sometime to develop themselves completely and purposively” (Idea 8:18, original emphasis). And even when he is discussing the character of the human being, the only terrestrial animal that “has a character, which he himself creates” (A 7:321), Kant’s teleological biology perspective threatens to cancel out the free choice that he attributes to the human animal: “Just as a man must develop from an embryo, so also must everything [*muß*. . . *alles*] rise up to its perfection. In human nature lie germs which develop and can [*können*] achieve the perfection for which they are determined” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:694). Must? Can? The modality of his pronouncements concerning humanity’s future sometimes shifts abruptly within a single sentence.

The details and implications of Kant’s teleological commitments, while important for assessing his philosophy of biology, are beyond the scope of this chapter.⁷ As regards their role in his anthropological writings, the main point to emphasize is that they enable Kant to inject both descriptive and prescriptive dimensions into his account of human nature. As I

⁶ In part for this reason, Brandt and Stark call Kant’s philosophy of history “a component of anthropology” (Brandt and Stark (1997), 25:liii). See also Sturm (2009), 355–6.

⁷ Recent discussions include Huneman (2007) and Zuckert (2007).

have stressed previously, Kant's anthropology "is not merely a descriptive account of human culture. Rather, his aim is to offer the species a moral map that they can use to move toward their collective destiny" (Louden (2000), 106).⁸ In pointing to natural, developmental structures within human beings, Kant is able simultaneously to describe what is presently the case as well as what, in the future, ought to be the case.

2. *Keime and Anlagen*

A key component in Kant's teleological orientation toward human nature and its development is his frequent use of the related terms *Keime* ("germs") and *Anlagen* ("predispositions"). In Kant's view, the nature and character of each biological species is explainable by reference to its unique set of germs and predispositions. As he states in *On the Use of Teleological Principles in Philosophy* (1788):

I myself derive all organization from organic beings (through generation) and all later forms (of this kind of natural things) from laws of the gradual development of *original predispositions* [*ursprüngliche Anlagen*], which were to be found in the organization of its phylum. (ÜGTP 8:179, original emphasis)

Keime and *Anlagen*, which appear to be used interchangeably in his less technical anthropological discussions of human development,⁹ refer to inheritable tendencies within the species whose full actualization is contingent upon favorable environmental factors.

Once we discover the *Keime* and *Anlagen* of the human species, we will know our inherent potentialities, and we will also know what areas of human life need to be attended to in order to help us achieve our potential. As Kant states in his *Lectures on Pedagogy*: "Many *Keime* lie within humanity, and now it is our business to develop the *Naturanlagen* proportionately and to unfold humanity from its *Keime* and to make it happen that the human being reaches his destiny" (VP 9:445). It is "our business . . . to make it happen" – i.e. even when we know what our *Keime* and *Anlagen* are, we need to also create the right environment for

⁸ Cf. Louden (2011), 76–7; Wilson (2006), 95; Zöller (2011), 140.

⁹ In *Of the Different Races of Human Beings* (1775), Kant distinguishes between the two as follows: "The grounds of a determinate unfolding which are lying in the nature of an organic body (plant or animal) are called *Keime*, if this unfolding concerns particular parts; if, however, it concerns only the size of the relation of the parts to one another, then I call them *natürliche Anlagen*" (VvRM 2:434). However, as is evident in many of the passages cited in the present section, Kant does not adhere to this distinction in his more informal anthropological texts.

them to develop properly. As he remarks at the beginning of the same set of lectures: “the human species is supposed to bring out, little by little, humanity’s entire *Naturanlage* by means of its own effort” (VP 9:441). Similarly, in a *Reflexion* he notes that knowledge of our natural *Anlagen* “teaches at the same time how we should work on ourselves in agreement with the most complete ends of nature” (Ref 1467, 15:646). And again, in the *Menschenkunde*: “the discovery of what kinds of *Keime* lie hidden in humanity gives us at the same time the means that we have to apply in order to hasten the unfolding of these natural *Anlagen*” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1195).

Prolonged and focused effort on the part of humans is thus needed to fully develop their biological *Keime* and *Anlagen*, but there is also a luck factor as well. All individual members of the species share the same inherent capacities, but some human beings are not in the appropriate environment to see their capacities developed. As Kant notes in *Friedländer*: “a savage Indian or Greenlander . . . has the same *Keime* as a civilized human being, only they are not yet developed” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:694; see also VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:857).¹⁰

What are the appropriate external conditions under which humans’ *Keime* and *Anlagen* are most likely to fully develop? At the most basic level, a physically challenging environment will serve as a spur to human development. As Kant states in *Pillau*: “The hardships of life are the incentives [*Triebfedern*] for the development of talents” (VA-*Pillau* 25:844). And similarly, in *Mrongovius*: “pain [*Schmerz*] for the human being is a spur to activity” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1417). But (as Kant implies in the remark cited earlier about Indians and Greenlanders) a civilized environment will also further the development of human capacities. In *Mrongovius*, for instance, he notes that the civilized state (*gesittete Zustand*), “which, however, we do not yet know,” is also the one “where all of the *Keime* of the human being will have been developed” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1417). But the single most important external factor that Kant draws attention to is a proper civil constitution: “the point in time when the talents of the human being can properly develop actually only arises in a civil constitution [*bürgerlichen Verfassung*]” (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1199). This achievement, too, is part of our biological potential, but it is also our business to make it happen. I discuss in more detail the precise nature and configuration of this civil constitution below.

¹⁰ But see also “struggle versus enjoyment” below. Kant is not consistent on this point. He does not believe that the *Anlage* to work and to struggle is evenly distributed among the human population.

Finally, what are humanity's most important inherent capacities? As we have seen, Kant is often exasperatingly vague on this issue. "Many *Keime*" lie within us, and it is our job to develop them (VP 9:445). And not all of our *Keime* are good. For instance, "nature has planted" in us "the *Keim* of discord" (A 7:322) – we are often at each other's throats. And the transcriber of *Mrongovius* notes at one point: "There are three *NaturAnlagen* in the human being: 1) laziness, 2) cowardice, and 3) falsity" (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1420; cf. Ref 1522, 15:894). But as we shall see later, good will eventually arise even out of the development of humanity's bad *Keime*. This, too, is part of nature's plan. The three predispositions that receive top billing in the printed version of the *Anthropology* are our technical, pragmatic, and moral *Anlagen*, each one of which serves to distinguish us from other terrestrial animals: "Among the living *inhabitants of the earth* the human being is markedly distinguished from all other living beings by his *technical Anlage* . . . by his *pragmatic Anlage*, and by the *moral Anlage* in his being" (A 7:322, original emphasis). Our *cosmopolitische Anlage*, which Kant refers to in a marginal note in the *Handschrift* to the *Anthropology* (see opening epigraph) is not, strictly speaking, a member of this core trinity, but it is nevertheless only through its realization that our destiny can be fulfilled. The development of our cosmopolitical predisposition is a means to realizing our moral predisposition.

By means of the crucial concepts of *Keime* and *Anlagen*, Kant is able simultaneously to set biological limits on human development, to account for human unity and diversity (through our shared potential but also our different interactions with the external environment), and to map out our future potential.

3. *Bestimmung*

Another key component in Kant's analysis of the character of the human species, already present in the title of this essay and in many of the previous citations, is the concept of "destiny" (*Bestimmung*). Many German Enlightenment authors wrote on this important theme,¹¹ and Reinhard Brandt, in his exhaustive study *Die Bestimmung des Menschen bei Kant*, goes as far as to call it "the leading center [*das dirigierende Zentrum*] of Kantian philosophy" (Brandt (2007), 7; cf. Brandt (2003), 85–7). On Kant's view, every creature has a *Bestimmung*, which consists in "the appropriate development of all

¹¹ For a representative survey of German Enlightenment texts on *der Mensch und seine Bestimmung*, see Ciafardone (1990), 39–119.

Anlagen of its nature" (A 7:329). At bottom, Kant's notion of *Bestimmung* is reminiscent of Aristotle's teleological accounts of natural organisms. We explain natural phenomena by appealing to "that for the sake of which" (*to tou heneka*) – viz. the natural goal or end (*telos*) to which each biological organism is directed (see, e.g., *Parts of Animals* I.1 639b12–21).

However, the German word *Bestimmung* can be translated in English variously as "destiny," "vocation," and "determination," and I think Kant's use of the term – particularly in its anthropological contexts – intentionally incorporates all three meanings. And because of this intended triple meaning, it poses an immense challenge for translators. There is no single word in English that captures all three meanings. The *Bestimmung* of a plant involves no planning, deliberation, or free choice on the part of the plant, and here "determination" might suffice as a translation. A plant is biologically designed to develop in a certain manner, and if it receives sufficient water, light, nutrients, etc., it will reach its natural *Bestimmung*. As Kant remarks in his *Lectures on Pedagogy*: "nature has after all placed the *Keime* in these plants, and it is merely a matter of proper sowing and planting that these *Keime* develop in the plants. The same holds true [*so auch*] with human beings" (VP 9:445). Nature has placed certain *Keime* in both humans and plants, and in both cases their natural *Bestimmung* is reached if and when their specific *Keime* are properly developed. Both types of organism will reach biological maturity with "proper sowing and planting." But part of our human *Bestimmung* involves openness and free choice, and so "determination" alone will not work as a translation. Again, the human being "has a character which he himself creates [*den er sich selbst schafft*]" (A 7:321), and this too is part of our *Bestimmung*. Our *Bestimmung* in fact includes *Unbestimmtheit* (indetermination). In describing the dexterity of the human hand, for instance, Kant writes: "by this means nature has made the human being not suited for one way of manipulating things but undetermined for every way [*unbestimmt für alle*], consequently suited for the use of reason" (A 7:323). Humans, as biological animals, have a built-in indeterminacy that is absent in other terrestrial beings. At some point in the distant past, a crucial discontinuity occurred between humans and other terrestrial animals. The human being "discovered in himself a faculty of choosing for himself a way of living and not being bound to a single one, as other animals are" (MA 8:112). This openness and indeterminacy, when combined with our inherent capacities of reflection, deliberation, and free choice, implies that realizing our *Bestimmung* requires work and effort on our part: "The human being should have to owe everything to his own efforts. This is . . . a great honor that nature has bestowed on us" (VA-Mrongovius 25:1417). Our *Bestimmung* is thus also

a vocation, a calling. As humans, “we feel determined/determined/called by nature [*von der Natur bestimmt*] to [develop] . . . into a *cosmopolitan society*” (A 7:331, original emphasis). And if there really is a *cosmopolitische Anlage* within us, this part of our *Bestimmung*, too, is part of our biological inheritance. But it will take an inordinate amount of effort and planning on the part of humans (not to mention good luck) to bring it about.

Our freedom is thus also part of the biology of our peculiar species, and this, too, is part of nature’s plan: “nature does not proceed without a plan or final aim [*nicht ohne Plan und Endabsicht*] even in the play of human freedom” (Idea 8:29).

4. Species/individual

A further difference between the *Bestimmung* of humans and that of other terrestrial creatures is that in the latter case each individual member of the species normally attains the complete *Bestimmung*, whereas in the case of humans only the species as a whole reaches it. As Kant remarks in the published *Anthropology*:

with all other animals left to themselves, each individual reaches its complete *Bestimmung*; however, with the human being only the *species*, at best, reaches it; so that the human race can work its way up to its *Bestimmung* only through *progress* in a series of immeasurably many generations. (A 7:324, original emphasis)¹²

Humans are able to build on and improve upon the cultural and scientific achievements of their predecessors – each generation “always adds something to the enlightenment of the previous one, and thus it makes the next generation more perfectly endowed than it was” (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1417).

In the case of other terrestrial animals, even in those that appear to exhibit some rudimentary cultural behavior (see, e.g., Whiten et al. (1999)), we do not find this progressive or cumulative sense of culture. Birds, for instance, as both Kant and many contemporary researchers hold, “do not sing by instinct, but actually learn [*wirklich lernen*]” (VP 9:443);¹³ one bird imparts the song to another “through instruction [*durch Belehrung*] (like a tradition)” (A 7:323n). To this minimal extent, they have culture. But birds keep singing the same songs; their songs do not exhibit the kind of development found in human musical traditions (not to mention science). In *Pillau*, Kant illustrates this crucial difference by reference to bees:

¹² Cf. VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1196; Ref 1499, 15:781; VP 9:445.

¹³ Cf. VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1416; Ref 1521, 15:886; Catchpole and Slater (2008).

each single bee is born, learns [*lernt*] to make hives, to produce honey, and dies, thus it has come to the highest degree of its *Bestimmung*. But this is what bees have done from the beginning of the world until even now; therefore they do not change at all. However, with humans it is completely different. [Those in] the ancient and first times were further away from their *Bestimmung* than the following ones . . . (VA-Pillau 25:839)

However, our earlier point about humanity's *Unbestimmtheit* needs to be factored in here as well. Human culture is normally progressive and cumulative, but there is no ironclad guarantee of this. For we are free beings who can and do change our minds. As Kant notes in the *Conflict of the Faculties* (1798):

No one can guarantee that now, this very moment, with regard to the physical *Anlage* of our species, the epoch of its decline would not be liable to occur . . . For we are dealing with beings that act freely, to whom, it is true, what they *ought* to do may be *dictated* in advance, but of whom it may not be *predicted* what they *will* do. (SF 7:83, original emphasis)

5. Humans and other animals

Our *Keime* and *Anlagen* are natural, physical properties that we have inherited from our biological ancestors. But Kant – unlike Ernst Platner and other physiological anthropologists of his era – is not interested in psychophysical investigations. In a well-known letter to former student Marcus Herz, written toward the end of 1773, Kant notes that in his own anthropology he omits entirely the “eternally futile inquiries as to the manner in which bodily organs are connected with thought” (C 10:145; cf. A 7:119). Physical explanations of psychological phenomena are irrelevant from the perspective of pragmatic anthropology, for while they may add to our theoretical knowledge of human beings, they do not contribute to our practical understanding of human conduct and life: “Everything that bears no relation to the prudent conduct of human beings, does not belong to anthropology” (VA-Friedländer 25:472).¹⁴

As a result, Kant's strategy for uncovering human *Keime* and *Anlagen* takes place not at the micro level of physiology (much less neurology) but rather at the macro level of comparative ethology.¹⁵ He compares humans to

¹⁴ See also Sturm (2009), esp. 281–303.

¹⁵ However, in *Pillau*, Kant tries out a comparative history strategy: “In order to find the character of the human species, I will attempt to compare one human age [*Menschen-Alter*] with the other, and from this to see, what the *Bestimmung* of the human being is” (VA-Pillau 25:838). By comparing different time periods of human existence with one another, one could distinguish constant from

other animals in an attempt to uncover the distinctive features of human nature. The *Mrongovius* transcription offers the clearest account of this strategy. The opening sentence in the “Chapter on the Character of the Human Species” reads:

One sees what is characteristic of the human species if one places the human being next to the animal and compares the two. In the system of nature, the human being belongs to the animal kingdom. However, if I view the human being as part of the world system [*Weltsystem*], he belongs to the rational beings. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1415; cf. VA-*Friedländer* 25:675)

In earlier versions of the *Lectures on Anthropology*, as well as in related writings on human nature, Kant devotes considerable space to comparative analyses of some of the physical characteristics of humans and other animals. Was the human being originally destined to walk on two feet or four? Is he by nature carnivorous or herbivorous? A predator or a peaceful animal?¹⁶ But by the time *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* is published in 1798, he has grown weary of such questions: “the answer to these questions is of no consequence” (A 7:322).

As noted earlier, the main answer that Kant settles on in the 1798 *Anthropology* is that the human being, when compared to other “living inhabitants of the earth [*Erdbewohnern*],” “is markedly distinguished” by his technical, pragmatic, and moral *Anlagen* (A 7:322, original emphasis). But the technical predisposition itself already signals our inherent rational capacity. Unlike other terrestrial animals, humans are endowed with the capacity of reason (see A 7:321) – “reason” not merely in the instrumental sense of choosing efficient means toward desired ends (Kant acknowledges that other animals do possess this capacity), but in the stronger substantive sense of deliberating about ends as well. The human being “is capable of perfecting himself according to ends that he himself adopts” (A 7:321). We have a choice regarding which ends to adopt. And our pragmatic and moral *Anlagen* in turn point to further differences between humans and other animals. We need a much more co-operative external environment, and immensely more time, in order to realize our potential: “The human being is determined/destined/called [*bestimmt*] by his reason to live in a society with human beings, and in it to *cultivate* himself, to *civilize* himself, and to *moralize* himself by means of the arts and sciences” (A 7:324,

merely transitory features of human life. But without the additional evidence of comparative ethology, one might still not know if one had succeeded in identifying unique properties in the human animal.

¹⁶ See VA-*Friedländer* 25:675–8; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1415–16; Ref 1521, 15:885; cf. RezMoscati 2:423–5.

original emphasis). And this long-term process of enculturating, civilizing, and moralizing ourselves in turn requires several additional fundamental activities that are also missing in other animals. For instance, in *Menschenkunde* and elsewhere, Kant announces that “the three means” to the progress implied by human culture, civilization, and moralization are public education, public legislation, and religion (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1198).¹⁷

But these comparisons between humans and other terrestrial animals do not tell the whole story about the character of the human species. What do we make of the human being when viewed as a member of larger world system of rational beings (see VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1415)? By the time his last set of *Anthropology Lectures* is published in 1798, Kant has managed to tame his long-standing extraterrestrial enthusiasms. “Experience does not offer us” any solid evidence regarding the existence of other species of rational beings elsewhere in the universe, and so, strictly speaking, “the problem of indicating the character of the human species is absolutely insoluble [*schlechterdings unauflöslich*]” (A 7:321; see also VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:859). In order to know what is truly unique about our species, we would need to compare ourselves carefully with another species of rational being. And while Kant remains “ready to bet everything” (KrV A 825/B 853) he has in defense of the claim that there is intelligent life on other planets, as an empirical anthropologist he is forced to work with the available evidence.

6. Struggle versus enjoyment

Kant’s repeated emphases on struggle and work over enjoyment and play are yet another key feature in his anthropological account of the character of the human species. Unlike later sociological theorists such as Max Weber who attribute the developmental success of some groups of humans over others to external environmental factors (in Weber’s case, the introduction of the “Protestant ethic” into European life),¹⁸ here again Kant offers an internal biological explanation. In an important Note from his *Anthropology Lectures*, he observes that the human being

is not created for the enjoyment of happiness, but rather for the development of all talents . . . The first question is: what is the *Bestimmung* of the human

¹⁷ Cf. VA-*Mrongovius* 15:1427; Ref 1524, 15:898.

¹⁸ See Weber (1958). In an influential footnote he writes: “Though we cannot discuss the subject here, many of his [Kant’s] formulations are closely related to ideas of ascetic Protestantism.” Weber (1958), 270n54.

species, enjoyment or culture[?] . . . The human being was not made for enjoyment [*Genießen*], but rather for activity . . . Not enjoyment, but rather development of powers [*Kräfteentwicklung*] was the end of nature. (Ref 1521, 15:887, 889, 890)

In the published version of the *Anthropology*, this emphasis on work and struggle is highlighted in the following passage:

No matter how great his animal tendency may be to give himself over *passively* to the impulse of ease and good living, which he calls happiness [*Glückseligkeit*], he is still *bestimmt* to make himself worthy of humanity by *actively* struggling with the obstacles that cling to him because of the crudity of his nature. (A 7:325, original emphasis)

Kant's exclusion of enjoyment and happiness from humanity's biological *Bestimmung*¹⁹ has implications far beyond his anthropology. First of all, it explains in large part his opposition to utilitarianism in ethics. Moral theories that encourage humans to aim directly at happiness are contradicting nature's plan for the achievement of our *Bestimmung*. In his defense of the need for moral theory in the *Groundwork*, he notes that "the human being feels within himself a powerful counterweight to all the commands of duty," and that this counterweight is summed up "under the name of happiness" (G 4:405). Moral theory is needed, at least in part, to protect us against the seductive call of this counterweight. Despite his effort "to work out for once a pure moral philosophy, completely cleansed of everything that . . . belongs to anthropology" (G 4:389), it would appear that Kant's anthropological assumptions do influence his ethical theory.

But a second, more disturbing implication concerns Kant's views regarding nature's distribution of the drive to work and struggle. He does not view it as being evenly distributed among all peoples and races. In *Pillau*, for instance, he states: "We find people who do not appear to progress in the perfection of human nature, rather they have come to a standstill, while others, as in Europe, always progress" (VA-*Pillau* 25:840). And also in several *Reflexionen* on anthropology: "many people do not progress further by themselves. Greenlanders. Asians. It must come from Europe" (Ref 1499, 15:781). "We must look for the continual progress of the human race toward perfection in the Occident and from there the spreading around the world" (Ref 1501, 15:789).

¹⁹ Kant's doctrine of the highest good plays an important role in his ethical theory, and here it is defined as "happiness distributed in exact proportion to morality" (KpV 5:110) – viz., a universal distribution of happiness among all moral agents in proportion to their virtue. But Kant does not view happiness as part of human beings' natural teleology.

In recent years several theorists have argued that Kant's hierarchical account of peoples and races "disappears in his later published writings" (Muthu (2003), 183), and that he changes "his earlier views on the status and characteristics of non-whites" (Kleingeld (2012), 113). But we have seen that he continues to emphasize the crucial importance of struggle and delayed gratification even in the 1798 *Anthropology*, and, as his chapter on "The Character of the Peoples" in that same work indicates, he continues to believe that some peoples have the necessary inherent drives to advance culturally and others do not. Regarding the Spaniard, for instance, Kant notes that he "remains centuries behind in the sciences" and "is proud of not having to work" (A 7:316). Unfortunately, it is not at all clear that Kant changed his mind on this matter.

7. Good out of evil

Another core feature of Kant's account of the *Bestimmung* of the human species is his claim that nature has planted unflattering *Keime* in us which will lead to highly beneficial results that we do not actually intend, *Keime* that are also the most efficient means toward these unintended ends. In a manner reminiscent of Adam Smith's famous account of the "invisible hand" which leads individuals to promote ends that are not part of their intention, and indeed to promote them "more effectually" than is otherwise possible (Smith (1979), 456), Kant argues repeatedly that human progress depends

not so much on what *we* do (e.g., on the education we give to the younger generation) and by what methods we should proceed in order to bring it about, but instead upon what human *nature* will do in and with us to *force* us onto a track we would not readily take of our own accord. (TP 8:310; cf. Idea 8:21)

However, in Kant's case the invisible hand is much bigger. He attributes to nature's *Keime* not just the promotion of the common good through efficient market mechanisms and self-interested economic behavior, but, ultimately, world peace itself: "nature guarantees perpetual peace through the mechanism of human inclinations itself"; "nature itself *does* it, whether we will or not" (EF 8:368, 365, original emphasis).

Kant's most famous articulation of this master trick of nature is his concept of "unsociable sociability" (*ungesellige Geselligkeit*), first presented in his 1784 essay *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim*. But there are important forerunners of it in several of the *Lectures on*

Anthropology, and in these earlier discussions Kant puts a decidedly moral spin on the matter: part of nature's hidden plan is to bring good out of evil. For instance, in his discussion of "The Character of Humanity in General" in *Friedländer*, he states:

depravity [*Bösartigkeit*] lies in the nature of all human beings. Since, as it is, this is a universal arrangement of nature, although it immediately aims at something evil [*etwas böses*], it thus must still indirectly have a purpose [*Zweck*] . . . Human beings' desires, jealousy, mistrust, violence, propensity for enmity against those outside the family: all these attributes have a reason, and a relation to a purpose. (VA-*Friedländer* 25:679)

In fact, as Kant notes later, this depravity relates to several beneficial purposes. Nature's first purpose is the spreading of human beings across the entire planet. "God wants that human beings should populate the entire world. All animals have their certain climate, but human beings are to be found everywhere . . . The best means of promoting this is pugnacity, jealousy, and disagreement with regard to property" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:679). But a civil constitution also develops as an unintended consequence of human maliciousness: "through what, then, did the most civilized constitution [*die civilisirteste Verfassung*] among human beings arise? Through the depravity of human nature. Hence this is the other great purpose which arises from it" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:680). And a civil constitution, he then adds, "is the source of the development of talents, of the concepts of justice and all moral perfection" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:681). So while "the human being is not good-natured by nature," "evil [*böse*] . . . is the source of the development of good in humanity" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:682; cf. 691).

In *Pillau* there is even an entire section entitled "Of the Origin of Good out of Evil" (VA-*Pillau* 25:843–45; see also VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1199; Ref 1521, 15:890), which repeats most of the same positive developments described in *Friedländer*. And in *Mrongovius* we find Kant again claiming that "the inevitable evil [*das unvermeidliche Uebel*] in the *Bestimmung* of the human being is the spur toward the good that the human being has to perform . . . All of the good pertaining to the *Endbestimmung* is nevertheless ultimately produced through this evil [*durch dieses Böse*]" (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1420, 1421; see also A 7:333). In *Mrongovius* we also encounter several passages that are close relatives of Kant's famous notion of unsociable sociability: the human being "has a propensity toward society due to his needs, which are far greater for him than for the animals. On the other hand, the human being also has a propensity toward unsociability" (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1416). "The human being is unsociable," but "the strong civil

association is further brought about by this unsociability; this produces more culture and refinement of taste" (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1421, 1422; cf. Idea 8:21).

Like Leibniz's earlier attempt to justify the existence of an omnipotent, omnibenevolent, and omniscient God in light of the abundant reality of evil in the world [*theos* + *dikē* = theodicy – see Leibniz (1985)], Kant's anthropological effort to show how good ultimately comes out of evil can be seen as an effort at "an anthropodicy, or a justification of the evils of human culture in view of the good they secretly serve" (Zöller (2011), 154). Something good will eventually come out this species, even if we are dealing with a race of devils rather than angels (cf. EF 8:366), and even if "out of such crooked wood as the human being is made, nothing entirely straight can be built" (Idea 8:23).²⁰

8. A perfect civil constitution

However, as noted earlier, the factor that Kant attaches the most importance to in his anthropological account of the development of the human species is what he calls a "perfect civil constitution." For instance, in *Mrongovius* we read, "The great masterpiece that nature has striven to bring forth through the perfect development of the *Anlagen* is the perfect civil constitution [*die vollkommene bürgerliche Verfassung*] . . . The *EndBestimmung* of humanity will be reached if we have a perfect civil constitution" (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1425–6, 1429; cf. VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1199, VA-*Friedländer* 25:681). And earlier, in *Pillau*: "On what does the attainment of the final *Bestimmung* of human nature rest? The universal foundation is the civil constitution" (VA-*Pillau* 25:843).

What does Kant mean by a perfect civil constitution? Although he does not offer many specific details in his anthropological writings, it is clear that what he is referring to is a set of principles governing a cosmopolitan society, the main aim of which is to put an end to war. In *Mrongovius*, for instance, he describes the perfect civil constitution as one

where the general well-being of the world of humanity is no longer interrupted by wars and various evils [*mancherlei Uebel*]; where the highest culture, civilization, and moralization is attained; where a general peace on earth will reign; and where conflict among princes will be resolved through judicial pronouncements [*Gerichtsaussprüche*]. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1429)

²⁰ See also Louden (2000), 153–7; Louden (2011), 75–8; Rorty and Schmidt (2009).

These judicial pronouncements would clearly have the force of binding law at the international level. As he notes a few pages earlier in *Mrongovius*:

states do not make up a universal association [*allgemeine Verbindung*], for they do not recognize any laws above their own. War then arises from this . . . [and] in order to avoid this barbaric state there must be: 1) a rule of law, 2) a judge who administers justice [*der Recht spräche*], 3) a power that holds oversight over these judicial pronouncements. In this way the Amphictyonic League of the Greeks and the plan of St. Pierre would be satisfied. (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1423; cf. 1426)

Like the ancient Greek city-states, but now on a global scale (a scale much larger than Saint-Pierre's proposal for the setting up of a permanent congress among European states), nations will elect members to a council whose chief task is the resolution of disagreements among member states. Once this milestone is reached, Kant notes in *Pillau*, it will constitute "the unification of human beings into a whole, which serves for the attainment of all formation of talents" (VA-*Pillau* 25:843). And this development will have to occur at a transnational, worldwide level, for it is only here that the rights of *all* members of the human species will be protected. Only at this level is the perspective of "what is best for the entire world" adopted (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1202), rather than what is best for a single nation or group of nations. This "universal *cosmopolitan condition*," which "nature has as its highest aim," is "the womb in which all of the original *Anlagen* of the human species will be developed" (Idea 8:28, original emphasis; cf. 22). This too is something that we are biologically predisposed to accomplish, but whether we will ever realize it depends on the choices that we and our descendants will make.

When we look back on Kant's pronouncements concerning the destiny of the human species from our not exactly idyllic present situation, it is all too easy to shake our heads at yet another Enlightenment dreamer who was not in touch with reality. But before we settle on this conclusion, it is important to factor in yet another key component of Kant's analysis – his prognosis regarding how long it will take us to reach our *Bestimmung*.

The *Friedländer* discussion of the character of humanity closes with a warning that the universal senate of nations which promises to put an end to war "is an idea which is possible, but for which thousands of years will still be required" (VA-*Friedländer* 25:696). The final page of the *Mrongovius* transcript is even more cautious and noncommittal about the means and time frame required: "that we will one day attain this state can certainly be hoped for. But what Providence will use as a means thereto remains

inscrutable and completely impossible for us to discover" (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1429). And in the published version of his *Anthropology* Kant is even more circumspect. Humans

feel *bestimmt* by nature to [develop] . . . into a *cosmopolitan society* [*cosmopolitanismus*] that is continually threatened by disunion but generally progresses toward a coalition. In itself it is an unattainable [*unerreichbare*] idea but not a constitutive principle . . . Rather, it is only a regulative principle: to pursue this diligently as the *Bestimmung* of the human race, not without grounded supposition of a natural tendency toward it. (A 7:331, original emphasis)

In this last passage Kant almost seems to be hedging his bets. On the one hand, we can see a "natural tendency" in this direction – it too is part of our biology, for we have inherited a cosmopolitical predisposition from our ancestors. On the other hand, it is an unattainable idea (cf. MS 6:350) and (in the language of the first *Critique*) a merely regulative principle, not a constitutive one. We are not to ascribe objective reality to this idea; rather, it is to be used merely as a rule by which to orient our thinking.²¹ The *Anthropology* passage is also notable for standing in tension with Kant's famous claim in *Toward Perpetual Peace* that "nature guarantees [*garantiert*] perpetual peace through the mechanism of human inclinations itself" (EF 8:368). The guarantee appears to have vanished.²²

So I do not think that we can rule out Kant's pronouncements for being overly optimistic regarding humanity's future. He is not naive about the inherent difficulties of establishing cosmopolitical unity. And his strong emphasis on the role of biology in human cultural and political development also puts him much closer in line with contemporary thinking about human nature. Unlike many nineteenth- and twentieth-century social theorists, Kant does not believe that human beings are born as blank slates waiting for social engineers to perform wonders on. Indeed, I think the anthropological Kant would endorse E. O. Wilson's declaration (issued as a challenge to traditional humanists and social scientists) that "biology is the key to human nature, and social scientists cannot afford to ignore its rapidly tightening principles" (Wilson (1978), 13). But Kant's biology is, of course, very different from Wilson's. Kant rejects Wilson's contention that "human behavior can be reduced and determined to . . . [a] considerable degree by the laws of biology" (Wilson (1978), 13), because he holds that our

²¹ See KrV A 179/B 221 ff.; A 509/B 537; A 569/ B 597; KU 5:379.

²² Brandt (1999), 505, severely understates matters here when he writes in his *Kommentar zu Kants Anthropologie* that "it is difficult to decide whether the . . . guarantee of perpetual peace is still maintained."

biology includes open-endedness and free choice. Humans, unlike other terrestrial animals, have a character that they themselves create. We have a capacity not just to choose the most efficient means toward desired ends, but to deliberate about our ends as well – to renounce some ends (even when they seem “quite irresistible” – see KpV 5:30) in favor of others that upon reflection seem more reasonable. And our distant ancestors’ related discovery in themselves of a faculty of choosing for themselves a way of living “and not being bound to a single one, as other animals are” (MA 8:112) marked a crucial turning point in human development. Finally, our ability to think cosmopolitically, to take into account the interests of all members of our species, and to plan the requisite legal and political structures for such a vision, represents a further difference. Other animals cannot think this far.

We share many core characteristics with other animals, but we also differ from them in fundamental ways. There are continuities as well as discontinuities between us and them, and a correct biology will not favor one to the exclusion of the other. In Kant’s comparative ethology we find this proper balance, but it is increasingly missing in contemporary cognition study work which, as one researcher happily notes, “elevates the animals, but . . . also brings down the humans” (Frans de Waal, as cited in Borenstein (2012)).

Is there a cosmopolitical predisposition in the human species which will one day win the upper hand over our more conspicuous and destructive selfish predispositions? Let us hope so.

*What a young man needs for his venture
into the world: the function and evolution
of the “Characteristics”*

John H. Zammito

Green young men – fifteen to twenty years old – at a provincial university on the easternmost frontiers of German civilization, aiming to take their place in a dauntingly demanding world: Kant proposed to mold and to equip them for their venture.¹ He had an explicit and *fixed* sense of what they needed, and it shaped his pedagogy over almost a half-century of university instruction. Most particularly, it shaped two innovative courses that became standbys in his curricular offerings across these many years: the course in *Physical Geography*, starting in 1756, and, later, and of central interest here, the course in *Anthropology*, starting in 1772. Kant’s pedagogical concern most directly informed the second part of his course in anthropology – what he termed “Characteristics.” Indeed, my thesis will be that the invariance of his pedagogical purpose permitted – if not enforced – a remarkable stasis in this section of Kant’s work over the course of some thirty years of delivery, notwithstanding the enormous changes in his critical philosophy and in the wider discourse in anthropology over the same period.²

Kant was a provincial who insisted on his cosmopolitanism.³ Famously, he never traveled outside the province of East Prussia, and rarely outside his birthplace of Königsberg, over his entire life.⁴ But he insisted that a

¹ I use my own translations of Kant’s works throughout this chapter.

² Odo Marquard made the “turn to the life world” the key to his historical account of the rise of anthropology, especially in Kant (Marquard (1982)). Andreas Käuser elaborates: “Marquard’s formulation of an epistemological ‘turn to the life world’, to which anthropology in Kant owed its development, signifies thus that the object of anthropology in the eighteenth century is the empirical observation of man” (Käuser (1990), 200). See also Moravia (1980); Fink (1993); Fox (1995); Barkhoff and Sagarra (1992); Faull (1995); Nowicki (2003); and above all Schings (1994). As Reinhard Brandt has stressed, Kant’s conception and his delivery of the anthropology course appear to have been unaffected by the “critical revolution” of the 1780s (Brandt (1991), 89).

³ Kant’s cosmopolitanism has been a very intensely discussed matter, especially of late. See, e.g., Kleingeld (2012); Brown (2009). His provincialism is less attended. Travel literature allowed Kant to *project* a cosmopolitanism, to imagine safely from his provincial study a tumultuous world of difference.

⁴ Tonelli (1975); Gause (1974); Stavenhagen (1949); Kohnen (1994); Ischreyt (1995); Weis (1993).

person living in a trading city like Königsberg, linked so thoroughly to the wider world, could judge it with discernment.⁵ Kant was quite proud of his own attainments in this regard. He was, after all, a saddle-maker's son, in all likelihood the first of his entire family to enter university, and he had become a distinguished *Gelehrter*: a person of status and significance in his cultural system.⁶ He had climbed quite high in his society, at least from the vantage of his origins, and he saw in his classrooms many other young men aiming to make that same ascent – sitting, to be sure, among others whose high birth made the matter of their education rather a question only of polish and performance (La Vopa (1988)). But all of them, as he saw it, could benefit from the “worldly wisdom” of one who had been known as the “gallant Magister,” and who was – by the time the Anthropology courses began – an *Ordinarius*, with all the rank, respectability, and (presumably) insight that entailed (Schöndörffer (1924)).

What exactly is “worldly wisdom”? We should remember that at just this moment the discipline of philosophy in Germany styled itself *Weltweisheit* (Schneiders (1983); Schneiders (1986); Schneiders (1985)). But what exactly was the “world” in that term, and what the “wisdom”? These were then, as they are still, polysemous terms. *World*, especially for the discipline of philosophy, meant at one and the same time the cosmos (all the way to the “starry heavens,” to invoke a famous Kantian phrase) and *le monde* – high society, as the French language, not at all incidentally, put it. And *wisdom* is even more elusively polyvalent. The *sophia* of the Greek etymological origins of philosophy was already tainted with a whiff of sophism. In Kant's own day, a suspicion of the “wisdom” of religious teachings – Christian, and a fortiori “Oriental” – would help the discipline of philosophy to assert independence from theology via the autonomy of “reason,” and to devise a historical construction of its own tradition exclusively from the Greeks (Bödeker (1990)).⁷ Along that historical path, practical efficacy and theoretical reason had episodically strained relations – through such stages as humanism versus scholasticism, *l'esprit systematique* versus *l'esprit de système*, and *Popularphilosophie* versus *Schulphilosophie*. Moreover,

⁵ “A large city such as Königsberg on the river Pregel . . . can well be taken as an appropriate place for broadening one's knowledge of human beings as well as of the world, [a place] where true knowledge can be acquired without even traveling” (A 7:120n).

⁶ Kant's sense of his personal social mobility has not been a matter of great concerns to historians of philosophy since they have been preoccupied, as he would himself have approved, strictly with how his ideas cohere. But see Hinske (1980); and Lehmann (1969). I have addressed these questions in Zammuto (2002) in more detail than is possible in the scope of this chapter. On Kant's life, consult Kuehn (2001); Vorländer (1977); Cassirer (1981); Ritzel (1985); Gulyga (1987). For an overview of Kant biographies, see George (1987).

⁷ See Park (2013).

thoroughly worked-out systems of knowledge, philosophical or other, offered no particular warrant for social competence. Kant knew a great number of professors who were socially inept. His scorn for the “pedant” was omnipresent.⁸ So how did Kant’s own way of teaching philosophy answer to this complex need for “worldly wisdom”?

Concretely, what could the classroom provide that could be taken into the world? That question pertained especially for those who were merely *passing through* his philosophy class on their way to the *Brodwissenschaften* that would get them their guild cards for future careers. Kant would not have his green young men for long, and he had to ask himself what he could give them of practical value. At the same time, there was need not to overwhelm these youths with *too much* “world.” Kant’s general pedagogical view maintained that education should try to avoid burdening students with ideas that “outstrip their years” and “can only be understood by minds which are more practiced and experienced” (N 2:305). Kant conceived the “Characteristics” precisely as a *primer*, providing the basics necessary to launch into the complexity of this world: a rough roadmap through the perils of social convention, not the last word on any of it. “Characteristics” addressed how to make sense of, and perhaps influence, *others*.⁹ To be sure, his lectures were laced through with admonitions about how these young men should fashion themselves, but the overt pedagogical goal was for them to be able to see (and perhaps see through) the self-fashioning of others. Kant surely hoped that his students’ private interest would be refined into social responsibility: that “cleverness” (*Klugheit*) should mature into “wisdom” (*Weisheit*) in their dealings with others, and thus the “general welfare,” not simply their own schemes, would be advanced. If Kant cared ultimately about their achievement of character in themselves, the course in anthropology and the “Characteristics” especially had to do with discernment about the character of others.

1. “Philosophy for the schools” and “philosophy for the world”

The contrast between “philosophy, according to the academic concept,” and “philosophy, according to the world concept,” developed by Kant

⁸ See Ritzel (1985), 75, citing from PPH, 27:1:81. Vorländer writes of “numerous expressions in Kant’s own writings concerning the [lack of] imagination and pedantry of scholars [which] can only be explained in terms of personal experience” (Vorländer (1977), 85).

⁹ As Reinhard Brandt observes, “to know whether or not a person has a stable or even moral character belongs to the sphere of cleverness.” That is, in the first place it serves as a category of assessment of others for pragmatic purposes (Brandt (1999), 12).

early in his logic lectures and replicated virtually verbatim in the first *Critique*, stood at the core of Kant's sense of his pedagogical mission from the very beginning of his university teaching career (Log 9:21–4; KrV A838–9/B866–7). Both in his logic and in his metaphysics courses, he clearly privileged accessibility for students (N 2:311). Even more concretely, pedagogical goals serviceable for his students' subsequent "life of action and society" constituted the *primary* agenda of Kant's physical geography course. He explained that this course had always been designed to provide students "adequate knowledge of historical matters which could make good their lack of *experience*" (N 2:312, original emphasis). Kant was already quite clear about *Weltkenntnis* when he inaugurated the course in 1758.¹⁰ He generalized his pedagogical point:

An education is still seriously lacking if it does not teach a person how to apply his acquired knowledge and bring about a useful employment of these [acquisitions] in accordance with his understanding and the situation in which he stands, or [in other words] to make our knowledge *practical*. And that is what knowledge of the world is. (VP 9:157–8, original emphasis)

In the *Announcement of the Programme of His Lectures for the Winter Semester 1765–6* Kant suggested that he planned to adjust his physical geography course "by condensing that part of the subject which is concerned with the physical features of the earth, to gain the time necessary . . . to include the other parts of the subject, which are of even greater general utility . . . a *physical, moral* and *political* geography" (N 2:312, original emphasis). This "other part of knowledge of the world" would "consider *man*, throughout the world[,] from the point of view of the variety of his natural properties." Kant elaborated:

Unless these matters are considered, general judgments about man would scarcely be possible. The comparison of human beings with each other, and the comparison of man today with the moral state of man in earlier times, furnishes us with a comprehensive map of the human species. (N 2:312–13, original emphasis)

In his 1775 essay "Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschen," Kant wrote:

the preliminary exercise in the *knowledge of the world* . . . serves to provide the *pragmatic* [dimension] for all the otherwise attained sciences and aptitudes,

¹⁰ See the essay "Entwurf und Ankündigung eines Collegii der physischen Geographie nebst dem Anhang einer kurzen Betrachtung über die Frage: Ob die Westwinde in unsern Gegenden darum feucht seien, weil sie über ein großes Meer streichen" (1757), 2:1–12.

so that they are usable not merely in the *schools* but in *life*. Thereby the prepared student may be introduced to the stage where he will practice his vocation, namely the *world*. (VvRM 2:443, original emphasis)

By the time he wrote this, Kant had supplemented his physical geography course with a new one devoted entirely to anthropology. In his letter to Marcus Herz, in the winter of 1773–4, Kant asserted his own concept of an empirical science of anthropology as against Ernst Platner's widely celebrated *Anthropologie für Ärzte und Weltweise* (1772):

my plan is entirely different [from Platner's]. The intention I have is to present . . . the sources from all the sciences which [bear on] mores [*Sitten*], efficacy [*Geschicklichkeit*], socializing [*Umgang*], the method of cultivating and governing men, and in the process to open up everything practical . . . I endeavor . . . to develop . . . a preliminary exercise in expertise [*Geschicklichkeit*], in cleverness [*Klugheit*], and even in wisdom [*Weisheit*] for the academic youth . . . to be distinguished from all other academic instruction, which can be called knowledge of the world [*Kenntnis der Welt*]. (C 10:145–146)

In the earliest surviving version of the *Anthropology Lectures* presented explicitly under the “pragmatic” rubric, the *Friedländer Lectures* of 1775–6, Kant's introduction to the course was all about *Weltkenntnis*, about the proper *use* of knowledge, which, he pointedly observed, separated theory from pedantry (VA-*Friedländer* 25:469). The academic needed to become a “man of the world” – the opposite of a pedant – by learning how to make his knowledge applicable in a popular context, so that the unschooled could appreciate and understand what he had to offer.¹¹

Yet Kant remained adamant that there was need for *systematic study*. He saw himself involved in an emerging *theoretical* branch of knowledge, and he claimed that this new empirical science could never *mature* if it were not organized and formulated as an academic discipline (VA-*Friedländer* 25:469). This was what he deemed lacking in all anthropology hitherto: “But why has no coherent science of man been constructed from the great treasure of observations of the English authors?” (VA-*Collins* 25:7). If anthropology had pragmatic payoffs, the task was first to learn the field. Kant posed as its criterial standards clearly *academic* notions of rigor (*Gründlichkeit*) and system. It should begin with the universal: “General

¹¹ Only when the philosopher brought all his science to the service of the vocation of man could he be a teacher of wisdom. Socrates, Kant pointed out, was often acclaimed as the one who brought philosophy down from heaven to earth by distinguishing between speculation and wisdom (PhilEnz 29:1, 9).

knowledge always precedes *local* knowledge if the latter is to be ordered and directed through philosophy: in the absence of which all acquired knowledge can yield nothing more than fragmentary groping around and no science" (A 7:121). It remains unclear, however, what sense of "science" Kant proposed for this new project. It certainly cannot be reconciled with his strict transcendental sense of science as expounded in his *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science*, but what sense could it have (MAN 4:467–72)? Kant seems to have put stress upon two features: first, systematicity, i.e. organization according to principles; and, second, empiricism, i.e. grounding in observational data. But the fact is that neither of these warrants seems compelling. Reinhard Brandt has made the most persuasive assessment here, in my view. Not only could anthropology not be a mathematical or even an experimental science; it could not be nomothetic either. Instead, it was a collection of observations, which Kant proposed somehow to systematize. Kant certainly provided many rubrics to create the impression of systematicity, but Brandt properly observes that "it is one of the peculiarities of the Kantian anthropology that the assertedly complete rubrics are neither derived nor explained as such, nor are they available from the wider anthropological scholarship." Kant's schemes were grounded neither in his systematic philosophy nor in state-of-the-art research in the empirical field, though the tacit appeal was to this latter consensus. Brandt concludes: "The lack of empiricism in an empirical field gets compensated by a sort of linguistic politics [*eine bestimmte Sprachpolitik*] . . . From the 'I call [it]' arises an 'it is called'; '[this] means', and then, in the end, '[this] is.' The pretended consensus replaces recourse to facts." Bluntly, "The Kantian linguistic politics hides the absence of data from experience" (Brandt (1999), 39–42). Still, one might hold out that what Kant offered, perhaps misleadingly, as a science, was a practical guide based on whatever "experience" he had managed to pull together and organize for articulation.

What was this "world" that Kant's students would enter upon? Perhaps the most pervasive feature of the middle of the eighteenth century in Germany was the rise of a "public sphere" and the *gebildeten Stände* (see Melton (2001)). Frank Kopitzsch notes that while "academic schools and universities were of substantial importance for the propagation of enlightenment ideas," over the course of the eighteenth century "the enlightenment expanded in all ways – in thematic terms as well as in recruitment – turning from a matter of 'scholars' [*Gelehrten*] to a concern of the 'educated' [*Gebildeten*]" (Kopitzsch (1983), 3–4). For a social group which defined itself and its progressive aspirations around education, the university and

its creation and propagation of “human capital” could not be a matter of indifference. Their struggle for self-definition and eventual public recognition found expression in a sharply negative attitude toward the model of enculturation that university scholarship offered. According to Hans Erich Bödeker, the new *gebildeten Stände* challenged the authority and the worldview of the established *Gelehrtenstand* (Bödeker (1992)). R. Steven Turner elaborates: “In the name of *Aufklärung* critics denounced the universities for their outmoded, medieval constitutions and their pedantic curriculum still mired in Wolffian philosophy, theological dogmatism, and the Latin imitatis” (Turner (1974), 501). In the words of Werner Schneiders, “school philosophy became conscious of its open flank to the world” (Schneiders (1983), 13). It needed to transform itself into the vanguard articulation of a new public’s aspirations to practical success and happiness in the world.¹²

The ideal of sociability (*Umgang*; *Geselligkeit*) was of immeasurable importance for the emergent *gebildeten Stände* (Mauser (1989)). Character formation (*Bildung*), in that distinctively pragmatic–moral sense central to the pedagogical undertakings of Kant, involved the effectiveness (*Geschicklichkeit*) and the cleverness (*Klugheit*) to cope and indeed prosper in this world, but also the (moral) wisdom (*Weisheit*) to do so with integrity. The cultivation of these capabilities stressed observation (*Beobachtung*), keen notation of particular instances, hence a process of learning that built upon empirical and historical accrual (Moravia (1973)). The cardinal value of *Selbstdenken* was a matter of the cultivation of individual judgment (*Urteilkraft*), personal knowledge, drawing upon all of one’s own life experience.

To be an educated, upwardly mobile young German in the second half of the eighteenth century was to struggle to situate oneself both in the territorial state of one’s locality and in the wider framework of a European culture. The challenge of achieving citizenship (*Bürgertum*) together with humanity (*Menschheit*) constituted the core of “enlightenment,” as Moses Mendelssohn famously articulated its meaning (Mendelssohn (1784)). A significant conflict over the purposes of higher education arose between individual self-fashioning (*Bildung*) and professional training (*Brodwissenschaft*). This had its concomitant in the “conflict of the faculties” within

¹² This gave sharpness to the challenge of *Popularphilosophie* to *Schulphilosophie* at the middle of the eighteenth century. See Holzhey (1977); Zimmerli (1978); Zimmerli (1981). The tension can be traced back to a controversy at the University of Halle between the *Klugheitslehre* of Christian Thomasius and the *Gründlichkeit* propounded by Christian Wolff. See Schneiders (1989); Lieberwirth (1994); Ciafardone (1982); Ciafardone (1983); Weber (1999); Hinske (1983); Grimm (1987); Herrmann (1984).

the German universities, on which Kant proved a discerning commentator (SF 7:1–116). In 1778 the Prussian minister of culture, von Zedlitz, sent Kant a semiofficial request to use his influence

to hold back students at the university from the bread courses [*Brod-Collegiis*] and to help them understand that the little bit of legal – indeed even theological and medical – learning [they pursued] would be vastly easier and more certain in application if the student had more philosophical knowledge. (C 10:236)

Kant's whole argument for the pre-eminence of the philosophy faculty in the university had this pragmatic backdrop.

2. The shape of the “Characteristics” over time

Throughout the decades of his course, the crucial source of material (and structure) for the “Characteristics” remained Kant's own *Observations on the Feelings of the Beautiful and the Sublime* of 1764 (Beo 2:205–56). In that work and in his subsequent anthropology, he explicitly invoked “observation and experience” (*Beobachtung und Erfahrung*) – that constantly conjoined terminology for the “new” method in the “science of man” (VA-Collins 25:7). The observations and experiences Kant offered were largely his own – formative of his own character by 1764.¹³

The order and length of the topics in “Characteristics” shifted across the years. In the published version of the *Anthropology*, Kant specified his organization in four “divisions”: “(1) the character of the person, (2) the character of the sexes, (3) the character of the peoples, (4) the character of the species” (A 7:285). This neat organization, advancing systematically from individual to species, was not the way the actual presentation of the Lectures evolved across time. The first version of his course, from 1772 to 1773, had a fourfold schema of presentation of a totally different form: (1) the bodily, (2) temperaments as link between body and soul, (3) mental capabilities (*Gemüthkräfte*), and finally (4) character as the discretionary application of these others (VA-Collins 25:218). The topics treated proceeded through temperaments, natural endowments (*Naturell*) – i.e. the *Gemüthskräfte*, (personal) character, physiognomy, national character,

¹³ When does one establish character? “Around forty is when character first really establishes itself” (Ref 1497, 15:769). Understanding in the sense of judgment is only achieved at forty (Ref 404, 15:163). And see Ref 1496, 414 (15:712, 167), where Kant speaks of judgment coming “not until after some years.” “After one's fortieth year one learns nothing new” (Ref 373, 15:148). Kant turned forty in 1764.

and finally the sexes. In *Friedländer*, from 1775 to 1776, no clear organizational scheme was offered at the outset; instead, a discursive treatment of notions from the 1772–3 version distinguished from the merely “physiological” the new “pragmatic” perspective that Kant claimed to be the authentic approach. The actual sequence of topics discussed ran parallel to the earlier version: first temperaments, then (personal) character, national character, physiognomy, a new section on species character, followed by a discussion of sex difference and a brief (never to be repeated) treatment of (child-rearing and) education (VA-*Friedländer* 25:624 ff.). According to the terse *Pillau* notes of 1777–8, Kant began with temperament, then went on to character, physiognomy, national character, sexual difference, and finally the character of the species, including a (dismaying) discussion of “races” (VA-*Pillau* 25:814 ff.). The *Menschenkunde* text, estimated to date from 1781–2, proceeded from temperament to character, then physiognomy, national character, races, sexual difference, and finally the character of the species (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1156 ff.). Finally, in the *Mrongovius* notes from 1784–5, the “Characteristics” were organized in two sections: natural endowments and actual character. Under the first, Kant discussed temperament, physiognomy, and (personal) character; under the second, he discussed sexual difference, national character, and the character of the species (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1368 ff.). One marvels that sexual difference should fall under actual character, since women in Kant’s view could not have any, and that national character should fall under the same organizational rubric, since he construed it as not primarily artificial but natural. In short, the organization of Kant’s “Characteristics” in the lectures was hodgepodge. It remains to be seen whether the argument, notwithstanding the architectonic, proves more coherent.

3. Knowing the “inside” from the “outside”

Kant described the entire second part of his *Anthropology Lectures* in terms of “cognizing the interior of the human being from the exterior” (A 7:283). This was the essence of the applicability of his insights for his young students as they ventured forth into the world. Thomas Sturm formulates this as the explicitly pragmatic, as opposed to theoretical, thrust of the “Characteristics” – “the practice of judgment of other persons and their ways of acting and reasons for acting . . . for empirical purposes” (Sturm (2009), 410).

In several of the student lecture notes, a section on “physiognomy” came specifically to be identified with this project of reading from outward

appearance the interior character of others, and Kant carried this forward into the published version: “Physiognomy is the art of judging a human being’s way of sensing [*Sinnesart* – better, perhaps: sort of sensibility] or way of thinking [*Denkungsart*] according to his visible form; it judges the interior by the exterior” (A 7:295). Kant was clear that humans did in fact try to judge by the demeanor of others, especially the expression in their eyes: “it is a natural impulse to first look [another] in the face, particularly in the eyes, in order to find out what we can expect” (A 7:296). But he maintained that this could never be made into a science and, at times, he doubted whether it could even be an art; it was at best a knack that some – perhaps “geniuses” – might be good at (VA-*Friedländer* 25:666). Over the course of the Lectures, the treatment of physiognomy grew increasingly critical, and by the published version Kant had turned largely dismissive of Lavater, whose views, he wrote, had been “completely abandoned . . . There is no longer any demand for physiognomy” (A 7:297).

Did Kant’s characterization of temperaments fare better? Were they any more promising pragmatically for his students’ *Weltkenntnis*? Temperaments had long served as a medical standby and a cultural convention by Kant’s time, and he added little, apart from his architectonic scheme differentiating the sanguine and melancholic as temperaments of “feeling” from the choleric and phlegmatic as temperaments of “activity” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:637). The most noteworthy development across the Lectures was the increasing emphasis on the strengths of the phlegmatic temperament, as against the starkly disparaging formulations of his *Observations*.¹⁴ By the later Lectures and the published version, Kant had come to esteem the strengths of the phlegmatic temperament rather highly, considering them a psychological analogue of truly philosophical wisdom (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1166–7). It is noteworthy, as well, that Kant found more and more of this strong phlegmatic temperament in his own Germanic people.¹⁵ Given, however, that he insisted that these temperaments were ideal types and that actual personalities displayed a spectrum of traits, it was not clear how much value in the world these typologies might have had for his students. They seemed rather a vehicle for Kant to exercise his categorizing propensity: a feature, we might note, that Kant also characterized as distinctly Germanic.¹⁶ When we ask, then, how much help Kant’s entire discussion

¹⁴ Beo 2:224; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1166; VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1374–5. See Brandt (1999), 286, 290–1.

¹⁵ VA-*Friedländer* 25:647; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1185. See Brandt (1999), 318, citing the unpublished *Physische Geographie* Hesse.

¹⁶ “The Germans are methodical, regular, orderly and precise . . . they observe order and rule, which has now risen to great heights . . . Their books contain much order and [many] parts” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:658).

of the outward mien of persons might actually have provided, I think the answer would appear to be quite modest.

4. Personal character

How Kant's conception of establishing character developed across the Lectures to the published version has been the focus of the most intense interpretative work in recent years, from the introduction to the critical edition by Reinhard Brandt and Werner Stark through the works of Felicitas Munzel and Thomas Sturm. All of them concentrate on the Kantian terminological discrimination of "way of thinking" (*Denkungsart*) from "sort of sensibility" (*Sinnesart*) as crucial to his conception of "character" in the anthropology.¹⁷ This innovation appeared in the 1775–6 lectures and became more established and prominent as the lecture courses continued across the 1780s and 1790s, marking, in Sturm's view, the most salient change in the course over time (Sturm (2009), 411). But there are striking limitations to the pragmatic role of *Denkungsart* in the "Characteristics." As even Sturm notes, it cannot be used to categorize sexes, nations, or races (Sturm (2009), 420). Thus Sturm is reduced to suggesting that Kant proposed using *Sinnesart* to assess others and *Denkungsart* primarily for oneself (Sturm (2009), 419). That isn't quite right either, since Kant did suggest that we seek to discern character in others in our pragmatic dealings with them (Brandt (1999), 12). But it demonstrates that Kant's project in his "pragmatic" anthropology became ambiguous between the problem of negotiating one's relation with others – the domain of *Klugheit* and the "pragmatic" par excellence – and the problem of developing a good character in oneself – *Denkungsart* as *Weisheit*. Moreover, there remains a gap of some significance between the "wisdom" articulated in the *Anthropology* course, albeit a social and political responsibility for the "betterment of the world," and the properly "moral" domain that Kant articulated in his ethical philosophy as such.¹⁸ There is, as Brandt and others have noted, not a mention of the "categorical imperative" or any of the rest of Kant's technical moral apparatus anywhere in the lectures or the published version of the anthropology (Brandt (1999), 14–16; see also Brandt (2003)).

¹⁷ Brandt and Stark (1997); Munzel (1999); Sturm (2009).

¹⁸ The connection of Kant's anthropology to his moral philosophy is the most controversial question in current Kant scholarship on these matters. See, e.g., Wood (1991); Loudon (2000); Jacobs and Kain (2003a).

What is clear is that Kant, in the *Anthropology Lectures*, was interested in human beings as *agents*, in discretionary judgment and self-fashioning, and concomitantly in accountability to the judgments of others. “Here it does not depend on what nature makes of the human being, but of what the human being *makes of himself*” (A 7:292, original emphasis). There was, to be sure, something reliable (predictable) in any form of character, and a fortiori of a good one, but since most of the human race was not to be credited even with the *capacity* for character formation, and since, moreover, it was extremely hard to *read* – whether in self or in others – it proves to offer little in the way of strictly “pragmatic” guidance.¹⁹

5. Sexual difference

Over thirty years Kant never failed to offer counsel to his young men regarding their engagement with the “fair sex,” both in good society and especially in marriage.²⁰ Over these years, Kant gave literally the same counsel. Since he had never actually negotiated a domestic relationship, he drew heavily upon David Hume and especially Jean-Jacques Rousseau for his assessment. Notwithstanding, Kant was quite sure of himself as regards women and their nature. He commented that women could only be understood in their own right in advanced and civilized societies, since in more primitive ones they were no more than a sort of domesticated animal (VA-*Friedländer* 25:700). In civilized societies, paramountly the French, women could be seen as setting the tone of sociability. He bluntly denied that women could ever attain to true character, insisting that a *Denkungsart* of their own was entirely beyond them (Brandt (1999), 291, 295). Yet he did discern in them a strong sense for “honor,” molded, to be sure, strictly by the conventions of their culture and estate, together with a strong need to captivate male attention and, ultimately, marital devotion (VA-*Friedländer* 25:632). Within marriage, Kant observed invariably and in the same wording, women sought to dominate [*herrschen*], while men had to administer [*regieren*] the household (VA-*Friedländer* 25:717; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1193). Inclination [*Neigung*] commanded, he observed, but the husband’s sober management sought to reconcile the caprice of

¹⁹ But for the best effort to make this work, see Munzel (1999). See also Stark (2003).

²⁰ Kant’s conception of women never varied far from what he wrote originally in *Beo* and in the *Bem* that he appended to that text. For a more extended discussion of Kant and women, see Zammito (2002), 120–31. See also Jauch (1988); Hull (1996); Schröder (1999).

the lady with the resources of the household (VA-*Friedländer* 25:717; see Brandt (1999), 440–1).

6. National character

Kant was at the cutting edge of his culture's concern with the ideals of *Bürgertum* and *Weltbürgertum*. What distinguished his view was his decided emphasis on the superiority of cosmopolitanism as a frame of reference and a goal of personal, social, and moral orientation (Kleingeld (2012)). Germans of his day were striving for a sense of cultural nationhood; that would be the great ambition of Herder and his generation. Kant found it appealing that Germans appeared *less* concerned with nationhood than with cosmopolitanism, or, in another phrasing, had as their distinctive national character an orientation to learning from other cultures and drawing the best from them (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1409). Germans of this era, especially in a context dominated by King Frederick II, wrestled with the overweening authority of French culture.²¹ To establish how to relate to this French standard of taste was a constant question from royal courts to urban society. German theater and literature, no less than German fashion and conduct, struggled to find some indigenous basis from which to cope with the French. One of the striking resources the Germans discovered in this quandary was the British alternative to French culture (Maurer (1987)). Kant was, in his early years, very taken with that Anglophilia.²² Other key figures of the German Enlightenment would carry it forward across their entire careers.²³ Thus a discriminating sense of French and British culture constituted a crucial desideratum for young men in the world of the late eighteenth century in Germany. But East Prussia was peculiarly attuned to the impinging mystery of the Slavic powers, especially Russia, which occupied the whole province during the Seven Years War, and which continued to fascinate Germans, and to recruit them for intellectual purposes, across Kant's lifetime. Beyond this, there was enormous fascination with a far wider world fostered by a burgeoning travel literature. Europeans of all nations, and Germans among them, could not get enough information about these exotic settings, whether civilized, like China and Japan, or

²¹ This obsession with French culture as a standard can be traced back at least to Thomasius (1687).

²² "Particularly important [in connection with Königsberg] is the close connection with England and the reception of the modern ideas of English philosophy (empiricism, sensualism, skepticism) as well as literature which it mediated, not to be forgotten the more liberal civic and economic ideas" (Westlinning (1995), 73).

²³ Maurer (1987); Kuehn (1987); Brandt (1992).

primitive, as in the New World, Africa, or the Pacific.²⁴ How to make sense of these newly discovered peoples figured directly in how to make sense of themselves as Europeans.²⁵ Kant was attuned to such considerations both in his readings and in his teachings.

Kant's treatment of national character showed only small changes over the course of his Lectures. The most notable feature was a dramatic cooling of his estimation of the English (Brandt (1999), 314). By contrast, his treatment of the French changed little, even in the context of the great French Revolution. One certainly finds little beyond commonplaces in any of this, and it seems clear that Kant leaned heavily on his sources, above all Hume on "National Characters." He used, with some sharply critical reservations, Montesquieu on historical sociology as well (VA-*Mrongovius* 25:1407). From his *Observations* of 1764 through the published *Anthropology* of 1798, these remarks offered little that one would not have found in the popular press. We might make one exception concerning Kant's starkly negative characterization of the peoples of the eastern frontier of Europe (Brandt (1999), 312–19). He disparaged the Poles as incapable of self-government, while he consigned the Turks and the Russians irrecoverably to the Orient and its penchant for despotism (Ref 1367 15:595). At times Kant would qualify his judgment of the Russians with the proviso that they had arrived so newly on the scene of nationhood that it might be too early to discern their character.²⁶ He was equally happy, though, with the view that they had come too late to ever attain one.

7. Races

The treatment of "races" in the *Anthropology Lectures* varied, and tended, on the whole, to diminish, since he was inclined to reserve his discussion of "race" to his course in Physical Geography (VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1195). Kant used "race" to characterize the geographical distribution of human populations, and he took the features of "race" to be primarily physiological, with cultural concomitants; hence it was a question primarily of "natural history," not appropriate to his new "pragmatic" treatment of anthropology. Accordingly, some of the *Anthropology* Lecture notes had discussions of

²⁴ The eighteenth century proved a key moment in Europe's recognition of a wider world of mankind. See Marshall (1982). Kant was particularly concerned with this matter, and amassed a considerable library of travelogues and histories of exotic peoples.

²⁵ For a new consideration of these issues with reference to France, see Harley (2012).

²⁶ See VA-*Friedländer* 25:661; VA-*Menschenkunde* 25:1185–6; Ref 1345 15:588; as well as Brandt (1999), 310–20, citing the unpublished *Physische Geographie* Hesse.

“race” but many did not.²⁷ In the ultimate, published form, Kant in fact referred his readers to the work of one of his commentators, Christoph Girtanner, for a fuller discussion of human “races.”²⁸ On the whole, “race” seemed a way to rank non-European peoples relative to the Europeans themselves, particularly in terms of the capacity for rational self-fashioning. Kant affirmed that only the European “race” was fully capable of this, finding various degrees of fault with all the others, most starkly with the New World peoples, then the Africans, but also with the peoples of Asia and the Pacific.²⁹ The future of the human race, he clearly believed, lay entirely in the hands of the “white” European peoples. Others would either “die off” or come under European dominion.³⁰ What Kant provided his young men, then, were widely circulating ethnocentric and imperialist stereotypes of non-European peoples, pronounced from the authority of his lectern.³¹ How “cosmopolitan” this will all have been, the reader can judge.

8. The species as a whole

Treatment of the character of the human species as a whole started in the 1775–6 lectures. The instigation was Rousseau and the wider discourse in the natural history of the human as a species of animal (*VA-Friedländer* 25:675).³² Kant wished to supplement such physical anthropology with the decisive discrimination, widely shared in his time, that man belonged as well to a different order, that of rational beings.³³ Kant had long been fond of Moscati’s claim that while by physiology man was designed to walk on all fours, reason impelled him to walk upright (*VA-Friedländer* 25:676; see

²⁷ There is no treatment of race in *VA-Friedländer* or in *VA-Mrongovius*. There is such treatment in *VA-Pillau* 25:816 ff.; and *VA-Menschenkunde* 25:1186–7.

²⁸ For the reference to Girtanner, see A 7:320. See Girtanner (1796). On this whole issue see Eigen and Larrimore (2006).

²⁹ *VA-Friedländer* 25:655; *VA-Menschenkunde* 25:1181, 1187; Brandt (1999), 313.

³⁰ *VA-Pillau* 25:816, 833, 840. See Brandt (1999), 290; and especially Larrimore (1999).

³¹ There is a question whether Kant derived these stereotypes from a specific source or from the general cultural environment of his age. See Eze (1995); Eze (1997); Bernasconi (2001); and Loudon (2000, 93–106). Much can be correlated with David Hume, but an even closer prospect has emerged in the scholarship concerning the role of Christoph Meiners. What is clear is that Kant did not learn any of this from Johann Friedrich Blumenbach. If anything, the influence in this vein went the other way. And Blumenbach was far more careful about drawing cultural and psychological features from physical ones than Kant appears to have been. See Dougherty (1990).

³² Rousseau’s *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*, and behind it Buffon’s *Histoire naturelle*, served as the decisive texts inaugurating this concern with natural history for Kant. In the background, too, was Linnaeus, with his classification of the human species among the primates.

³³ On the relation of Kant’s physical anthropology to his “philosophical” anthropology, see esp. Cohen (2009a).

RezMoscati 2:421–6). Natural historians found these arguments less than compelling, but that did not stop Kant.³⁴ Similarly, Kant took as a key distinction between humans and animals that humans had spread across the entire planet, while animals were confined to specific geographical niches. He explained this trait as a providential consequence of human belligerence, driving the less powerful peoples to the far peripheries (VA-Friedländer 25:679). This was but one aspect of his crucial anthropological category of “unsocial sociability” which would find prominence in his *Idea for a Universal History* and elsewhere (VA-Mrongovius 25:1421 ff., *Idea* 8:15–32). Indeed, we find in Kant’s *Anthropology Lectures* the first formulations of many of his characteristic views in philosophy of history and political philosophy, especially this idea of “unsocial sociability” as the cunning of nature in evoking and disciplining human capabilities, ultimately enabling the teleological prospect of republican world government.

The main thrust of his argument was that the drive to humanity entailed the suppression of animality, that the *animal rationabile* needed to become the *animal rationale* (A 7:321 ff.). He accounted for this developmental process both at the level of the individual, contrasting the natural age of sexual maturity with the socially accepted age for its actualization, and at the level of societies, discussing Rousseau’s famous question whether man was not happier in the state of nature than in that of civilization. Kant contended, in line with Rousseau himself, that what humans had in the conjectural state of nature was an absence of good and evil, an inhuman, animal “innocence” which nature itself demanded be displaced by self-determination (VA-Friedländer 25:684–5, 689, VA-Mrongovius 25:1417–18). While instinct governed animal behavior, humans were thrust by nature upon their own, rational devices (VA-Friedländer 25:682 ff., VA-Menschenkunde 25:1199).³⁵ But with rational maxims came imaginative elaborations, and desires out-paced achievements. “In the natural state, the incentives for vices are not roused; these are first roused in the civil state by the increase in needs and desires which arise from it” (VA-Friedländer 25:687). The result was, to be sure, a miserable civilization, but one in which human capabilities were compelled to develop and human reason took charge of behavior, even if with little moral improvement. Thus, Kant wrote, “Now . . . the human being is not yet in the perfection of the civil state . . . When, however, will such perfection be attained?” (VA-Friedländer 25:690). It could never be achieved at the level of the individual human, in contrast with

³⁴ Blumenbach made a thorough criticism of Moscati in his inaugural dissertation of 1775. See Blumenbach (1865).

³⁵ The decisive discussion of these issues for the German Enlightenment was Reimarus (1760).

animals, each of which routinely fulfilled its species potential; in man this could only be a species achievement (VA-*Pillau* 25:839). Nonetheless, Kant was confident of this human destination (*Bestimmung*). “The human race must . . . actually attain this degree of perfection, which is the purpose of its vocation, and even if it takes centuries” (VA-*Friedländer* 25:693–4). This species achievement would be contingent upon political progress, the rise of republican governments, and international accords. Kant believed, as well, that religion would play a crucial role, as humans pursued their vocation trusting in providential assistance (VA-*Friedländer* 25:695 ff.). Brandt suggests that the treatment of the character of the species as a whole brought a new dimension into the *Lectures*, the domain of the “ought” over against that of the “is” (Brandt (1999), 9). Perhaps, he elaborates, the darkness of the empirical account of human interactions that Kant had developed in the empirical psychology and the discussion of human character needed the redemption of a providential purpose for the species as a whole (Brandt (1999), 12–13). Nevertheless, as Brandt recognizes, the teleological destination (*Bestimmung*) of the human species was not exactly a matter of “pragmatic” observation. It was, rather, something more precisely “practical,” i.e. a hope that enabled moral steadfastness (Brandt (1999), 10).

In sum, Kant shifted in his “Characteristics” between *predictability*, as a measure enabling effective negotiation with others in society, and *accountability*, a measure of approval or disapproval of others in these same negotiations. At the same time, flux between natural endowment (*Sinnesart*) and discretionary behavior (*Denkungsart*) made the “pragmatic point of view” at best approximate. Finally, the question whether the “Characteristics” aimed primarily at discerning the character of others or at shaping one’s own remains vexed, as the recent critical literature makes amply clear. Sturm resorts to the view that Kant’s work was really not intended as a guide for private advancement based on empirical rules, since it recognized too much uncertainty (Sturm (2009), 461). Instead, it was a *perspective* on the complexity that pervaded human practices and their interpretation. Sturm’s view leads one to consider it almost a *contemplative* (academic?) wisdom, not a guide for action (in the world). Or, at best, it bespoke the consoling *hope* for a benign species future to hold against the chilling factuality of human follies, drawing on the few features that seemed to betoken the legitimacy of such hope.³⁶

³⁶ If, as Brandt (1999, 16) has argued effectively, and Sturm (2009, 407) has echoed, Kant does not address explicitly his famous “fourth” question – “what is man?” – in the anthropology materials, he certainly comes to give increasing scope to reflections in light of his “third” question, “what can man hope?”

9. Conclusion

Steven Lestition has argued that there were virtually no discernible changes in the course after about 1779 (Lestition (1985)). That it had not changed significantly in content over thirty years – three decades that saw enormous growth in cultural anthropology across the European and specifically the German intellectual landscape – may help explain why the book version of his famous lectures proved a distinct disappointment when it appeared in 1798.³⁷ A lot of the energy and liveliness which had characterized the course in its early years seems to have been wrung out of the published version. Friedrich Schleiermacher's harsh review of the work, faulting it for failing to offer more than tired clichés, found no one willing to rise to its defense.³⁸ Indeed, "Characteristics" correlated most closely with investigations in the "science of man" across the European Enlightenment, but Kant seems to have taken little account of the work that paralleled his own over these decades. When we compare the richness of comparative cultural history and ethnography offered by Kant's peers – in Germany and beyond – it appears that there was not very much in Kant's "Characteristics" that seemed cutting-edge or path-setting.³⁹ Helmut Pfofenauer suggests that Kant suppressed rather than articulated the anthropological contingencies that were at the heart of the eighteenth-century science of man: "Those irritating experiences of the complex and often obscure, alienating properties of individuality which interested the psychologists and which approached articulation in the attempts of self-reflexive anthropology, came [by Kant's measures] to be tabooed" (Pfofenauer (1987), 10).

We may be able to make sense of this best if we understand the course very concretely in terms of his pedagogical project. We should ask whether, from Kant's perspective, the life-situation and problems of his students changed significantly over the later eighteenth century. Since in his view they did not, Kant saw no reason to change his guiding idea for the course. Moreover, the course was unquestionably popular, not only in Königsberg but by reputation and by the distribution of student notes throughout Germany.⁴⁰ Dare we suspect that the success or popularity of his course made Kant somewhat complacent? More importantly, two crucial theoretical considerations pervade current commentary. First, should Kant have

³⁷ On the immediate reception in 1798, see Brandt (1999), 7. Goethe, to take one key figure, found the work less than prepossessing.

³⁸ Schleiermacher (1799). On the absence of rebuttal to Schleiermacher's critique, see Brandt (1999), 7. On the reception, see also Wellman (2010).

³⁹ See Carhart (2007); and Wellman (2010).

⁴⁰ See the introduction to the translation of Kant's *Anthropology* (Louden (2007a), 228).

essayed more systematically to integrate his critical philosophy with his anthropology? Kant scholars have been preoccupied with this first issue, and the tantalizing proposal that his famous “fourth question” – what is man? – might well encompass the entire philosophical project. But Kant never wrought a finished philosophical anthropology, and it is not clear that this field derives primarily from his vision.⁴¹ Second, why did he not incorporate the empirical richness available in the new cultural anthropology of his contemporaries? Historians of disciplinary anthropology, I believe, must focus on this second question. There is reason to question whether Kant’s vision of what anthropology as a discipline should become had any sustained impact on the subsequent development of that field. I have taken the view that it was far less influential than rival versions – both at home and abroad.⁴² His version of empirical anthropology, to be blunt, led nowhere.⁴³ Kant’s true importance lay in other areas.

It is Kant as technical philosopher, not Kant as pedagogue or anthropologist, who has preoccupied the attention of the Western mind. If “Characteristics” was Kant’s representative work, how important would he appear to us historically? One might have recourse to a crucial observation by Lewis Beck: Kant would appear one of many “writers” of his time and no more historically significant to us than they have become (Beck (1969), 426). Even taking to heart what Kant professed explicitly as the goal of his work, that it serve as a propaedeutic to discerning social judgment in his young students, we might (perhaps cruelly) conduct a little thought experiment. We might wonder how a Jane Austen would have judged the worldly wisdom of the “Sage of Königsberg.” What help would she have thought it offered young men, and how would she have judged what it said of women, young or old? I conjure up yet another scenario: I cannot help imagining the wry smile of condescension that would have sprung up on the face of La Rochefoucauld or his companion, Madame de Lafayette, a century earlier. *Ah, oui*, I can hear them whisper to one another, *un vrai professeur!*

⁴¹ See Fischer (2008) for a characterization of the later development of this discourse.

⁴² See Zammito (2002), 301 ff.

⁴³ “The Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View remained a stray piece [*ein erratischer Block*] in the history of sciences” (Brandt (1999), 43).

Bibliography

- Abegg, J. F. (1976). *Reisetagebuch von 1798*, ed. W. and J. Abegg. Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag.
- Allais, Lucy (2007). "Kant's Idealism and the Secondary Quality Analogy," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 45(3), 459–84.
- Allison, Henry E. (1990). *Kant's Theory of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2011). *A Commentary to Kant's Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Arens, Katherine (1990). "Kant, Herder, and Psychology," in *Herder Today: Contributions from the International Herder Conference 1987*, ed. K. Mueller-Vollmer. Berlin: De Gruyter, 190–206.
- Barkhoff, Jürgen, and Eda Sagarra, eds. (1992). *Anthropologie und Literatur um 1800*. Munich: Iudicium Verlag.
- Barnard, Alan (2000). *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baron, Marcia (1995). *Kantian Ethics (Almost) without Apology*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Basedow, Johan Bernhard (1776). *Erstes Stück des Philanthropischen Archivs*. Dessau.
- Baumgarten, Alexander Gottlieb (1757). *Metaphysica*, 4th ed. Halle: Hemmerde.
- (2011) *Metaphysica Historisch-Kritische Ausgabe*, ed. Günter Gawlick and Lothar Kreimendahl. Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt: Frommann Holzboog.
- Bayle, Pierre (1738). *Dictionary Historical and Critical*, trans. John Peter Bernard, Thomas Birch, John Lockman and other hands, London.
- Beck, Lewis White (1969). *Early German Philosophy: Kant and His Predecessors*. Reprint Bristol: Thoemmes, 1996.
- Berkeley, George (1709). *An Essay towards a New Theory of Vision*. Dublin: Rhames and Papyat.
- Berlin, Isaiah (1996). "Kant as an Unfamiliar Source of Nationalism," in *The Sense of Reality*, ed. H. Hardy. London: Pimlico, 232–48.
- Bernasconi, Robert (2001). "Who Invented the Concept of Race? Kant's Role in the Enlightenment Construction of Race," in *Race*, ed. R. Bernasconi. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, 11–36.

- Bien, Günther (1974). "Kants Theorie der Universität und ihr geschichtlicher Ort," *Historische Zeitschrift* 219, 551–77.
- Blumenbach, J. F. (1865). *Anthropological Treatises*. London: Longman.
- Bödeker, Hans Erich (1990). "Von der 'Magd der Theologie' zur 'Leitwissenschaft': Vorüberlegungen zu einer Geschichte der Philosophie des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert* 14(1), 19–57.
- (1992). "Die 'gebildeten Stände' im späten 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert: Zugehörigkeit und Abgrenzungen. Mentalitäten und Handlungspotentiale," in *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert. Teil iv*, ed. Jürgen Kocka. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 21–52.
- Borenstein, Seth (2012). "Animal Intelligence: What Do They Know?" *Portland Press Herald*, 25 June 2012, A2.
- Borges, Maria (2004). "What Can Kant Teach Us about Emotions?" *Journal of Philosophy* 101, 140–58.
- (2008). "Physiology and the Controlling of Affects in Kant's Philosophy," *Kantian Review* 13, 46–66.
- Boxill, Bernard and T. Hill Jr. (2001). "Kant and Race," in *Race and Racism*, ed. B. Boxill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 448–71.
- Brandt, Reinhard (1991). "Beobachtungen zur Anthropologie bei Kant (und Hegel)," in *Psychologie und Anthropologie oder Philosophie des Geistes*, ed. B. Tuschling and F. Hespe. Stuttgart, 75–106.
- (1992). "Die englische Philosophie als Ferment der kontinentalen Aufklärung," in *Europäische Aufklärung(en): Einheit und nationale Vielheit*, ed. S. Jütter and J. Schlobach. Hamburg: Meiner, 66–79.
- (1994). "Kants pragmatische Anthropologie: Die Vorlesung," *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 19, 41–9.
- (1999). *Kritischer Kommentar zu Kants Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht (1798)*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner.
- (2003). "The Guiding Idea of Kant's Anthropology and the Vocation of the Human Being," in *Essays in Kant's Anthropology*, ed. B. Jacobs and P. Kain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 85–104.
- (2007). *Die Bestimmung des Menschen bei Kant*. Hamburg: Meiner.
- Brandt, Reinhard and Werner Stark (1997). "Einleitung" to *Kants Vorlesungen*, Band 2. *Vorlesungen zur Anthropologie*, AA: 25:1:vii–cli.
- Brockes, Barthold Heinrich (1740). *Aus dem Englischen übersetzter Versuch vom Menschen, des Herrn Alexander Pope esq. nebst verschiedenen andern Uebersetzungen und einigen eigenen Gedichten. Nebst einer Vorrede und einem Anhang von Briefen, worinnen die Einwürfe des Hrn. C... wider den Essay on Man beantwortet werden, aus der History of the Works of the Learned übersetzt von B. J. Zinck*. Hamburg: Herold.
- Brown, Garreth Wallace (2009). *Grounding Cosmopolitanism: From Kant to the Idea of a Cosmopolitan Constitution*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Buffon, George-Louis Leclerc, Comte de (1749–57). *Histoire Naturelle*, 15 volumes. Paris: Imprimerie du Roi.

- (1750–4). *Allgemeine Historie der Natur mit einer Vorrede [von] Albrecht von Haller*. Hamburg and Leipzig: Grund und Holle.
- (1771–4). *Herrn von Buffons Allgemeine Naturgeschichte*. Berlin: Pauli.
- (1797). *Buffon's Natural History*, 10 volumes, trans. J. Barr. London: H. D. Symonds.
- Carhart, Michael (2007). *The Science of Culture in Enlightenment Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cassirer, Ernst (1981). *Kant's Life and Thought*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Catchpole, C. K. and P. J. B. Slater (2008). *Bird Song: Biological Themes and Variations*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cavallar, Georg (2012). "Cosmopolitan Education in the 1770s: Basedow and Kant." Paper read at the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Annual Conference, New College, Oxford University, 30 March 2012.
- Ciafardone, Raffaele (1983). "Von der Kritik an Wolff zum vorkritischen Kant: Wolff-Kritik bei Rüdiger und Crusius," *Studien zum achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, 4, *Christian Wolff 1679–1754*, ed. W. Schneiders. Hamburg: Meiner, 289–306.
- (1982). "Über das Primat der praktischen Vernunft vor der theoretischen bei Thomasius und Crusius mit Beziehung auf Kant," *Studia Leibnitiana* 14, 127–35.
- ed. (1990). *Die Philosophie der deutschen Aufklärung: Texte und Darstellung*. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- Clewis, Robert R. (2009). *The Kantian Sublime and the Revelation of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, Alix (2006). "Kant on Epigenesis, Monogenesis and Human Nature," *Studies in History and Philosophy of the Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 37(4), 675–93.
- (2008). "Kant on Anthropology, Alienology and Physiognomy: The Opacity of Human Motivation and Its Anthropological Implications," *Kantian Review* 13(2), 84–104.
- (2009a). *Kant and the Human Sciences: Biology, Anthropology and History*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- (2009b). "Kant's Concept of Freedom and the Human Sciences," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 39(1), 113–36.
- Comenius, Johann Amos (2000). *Große Didaktik: Die vollständige Kunst, alle Menschen alles zu lehren*, ed. and trans. Andreas Flitner. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Condorcet, Jean-Antoine-Nicolas de Caritat (1790). *Sur l'admission des femmes aux droits de cité*. Paris.
- David-Ménard, Monique (2000). "Kant's 'An Essay on the Maladies of the Mind' and Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and the Sublime," *Hypatia* 15, 82–98.
- Dean, Richard (2006). *The Value of Humanity in Kant's Moral Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Descartes, René (1965). *Discourse on Method, Optics, Geometry, and Meteorology*, trans. Paul J. Olscamp. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

- De Witt, Janelle (2014). "Respect for the Moral Law: The Emotional Side of Reason," *Philosophy* 89(1), 31–62.
- Diamond, Jared (1999). *Guns, Germs, and Steel*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Diderot, Denis (1992). *Political Writings*, trans. and ed. John Hope Mason and Robert Wokler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dilthey, Wilhelm (1922). *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften*, Volume 1 of *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Bernhard Groethuysen. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner.
- (1989). *Introduction to the Human Sciences. Selected Works*, Volume 1. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dougherty, Frank (1990). "Christoph Meiners und Johann Friedrich Blumenbach im Streit um den Begriff der Menschenrasse," in *Die Natur des Menschen: Probleme der Physischen Anthropologie und Rassenkunde (1750–1850)*, ed. G. Mann and F. Dumont. Stuttgart and New York: Gustav Fischer, 89–111.
- Dyck, Corey W. (2009). "The Divorce of Reason and Experience: Kant's Paralogisms of Pure Reason in Context," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 47(2), 249–75.
- Edelman, Bernard (1997). *The House that Kant Built*, trans. Graeme Hunter. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Eigen, Sara and Mark Larrimore, eds. (2006). *The German Invention of Race*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo (2000). *Essential Writings*, ed. B. Atkinson. New York: Random House.
- Eze, Emmanuel, ed. (1995). "The Color of Reason: The Idea of 'Race' in Kant's Anthropology," in *Anthropology and the German Enlightenment: Perspectives on Humanity*, ed. K. Faull. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 200–24.
- (1997). *The Idea of Race in the Enlightenment*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Faull, Katherine, ed. (1995). *Anthropology and the German Enlightenment: Perspectives on Humanity*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.
- Fellows, Otis (1960). "Buffon and Rousseau: Aspects of a Relationship," *PMLA* 75, 184–96.
- Ferrari, Jean, ed. (1997). *L'année 1798. Kant et la naissance de l'anthropologie au siècle des Lumières*. Paris: Vrin.
- Fink, Karl J. (1993). "Storm and Stress Anthropology," *History of the Human Sciences* 6, 51–71.
- Firla, Monika (1981). *Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Anthropologie und Moralphilosophie bei Kant*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Fischer, Joachim (2008). *Philosophische Anthropologie: Eine Denkrichtung des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Freiburg and Munich: Alber.
- Foucault, Michel (2008). *Introduction à l'anthropologie*. Paris: Vrin.
- Fox, Christopher (1995). "Introduction: How to Prepare a Noble Savage: The Spectacle of Human Science," in *Inventing Human Science: Eighteenth-Century Domains*, ed. C. Fox, R. Porter, and R. Wokler. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1–30.

- Frierson, Patrick (2003). *Freedom and Anthropology in Kant's Moral Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2005). "Kant's Empirical Account of Human Action," *Philosopher's Imprint* 5(7), 1–32.
- (2008). "Empirical Psychology, Common Sense, and Kant's Empirical Markers for Moral Responsibility," *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 39, 473–82.
- (2009). "Kant on Mental Disorder," *History of Psychiatry* 20(3), 290–310.
- (2013). *Kant's Questions: What Is the Human Being?* London: Routledge.
- (2014). *Kant's Empirical Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fusil, C. A. (1930). "Lucrece et les litterateurs, poètes et artistes du xviii siècle," *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 37, 161–76.
- Gause, Fritz (1974). *Kant und Königsberg*. Leer, Ostfriesland: Rautenberg.
- George, Rolf (1987). "The Lives of Kant," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 47, 485–500.
- Girtanner, Christoph (1796). *Über das Kantische Prinzip für Naturgeschichte: Ein Versuch diese Wissenschaft philosophisch zu behandeln*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Greene, John C. (1959). *The Death of Adam: Evolution and Its Impact on Western Thought*. Ames: University of Iowa Press.
- Gregor, Mary J. (1974). "Introduction," in Immanuel Kant, *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, ix–xxv.
- Grimm, Gunter (1987). "Vom Schulfuchs zum Menschheitslehrer: Zum Wandel des Gelehrtentums zwischen Barock und Aufklärung," in *Über den Prozess der Aufklärung in Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. H. E. Bödeker and U. Herrmann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 14–38.
- Gulyga, Arsenji (1987). *Immanuel Kant: His Life and Thought*, trans. M. Despalatovic. Boston, Basel, and Stuttgart: Birkhäuser.
- Guyer, Paul (1993). "Kant's Morality of Law and Freedom," in *Kant and Critique: New Essays in Honor of W. B. Werkmeister*, ed. R. B. Dancy. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 43–89. Reprinted in Guyer (2000), 129–71.
- (1995). "Freiheit als 'der innere Werth der Welt'," in *Das Recht der Vernunft*, ed. C. Fricke, P. König, and T. Petersen. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 231–62. English version in Guyer (2000), 96–125.
- (1996). "The Value of Agency: Review Essay of Barbara Herman, *The Practice of Moral Judgment*," *Ethics* 106, 404–23.
- (1998). "The Value of Reason and the Value of Freedom: Review Essay of Christine M. Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*," *Ethics* 109, 22–35.
- (2000). *Kant on Freedom, Law and Happiness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (2007). *Kant's Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals: A Reader's Guide*. London: Continuum.
- (2009). "Kant's Teleological Conception of Philosophy and Its Development," *Kant Yearbook* 1, 57–97.

- (2011). "Kantian Perfectionism," in *Perfecting Virtue: New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, ed. L. Jost and J. Wuerth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 194–214.
- (2013). "Freedom and the Essential Ends of Mankind," in *Proceedings of the XI. International Kant Congress*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 229–44.
- Haller, Albrecht (1751). *Versuch Schweizerischer Gedichte: Sechste, rechtmäßige, vermehrte und veränderte Auflage*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.
- (1794). *The Poems of Baron Haller, Translated into English by Mrs. Howorth*. London: J. Bell.
- Hardtwig, Wolfgang (1985). "Krise der Universität, studentische Reformbewegung (1750–1819) und die Sozialisation der jugendlichen deutschen Bildungsschicht: Aufriß eines Forschungsproblems," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 11, 155–76.
- (1986). "Studentenschaft und Aufklärung: Landsmannschaften und Studentenorden in Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert," in *Sociabilité et société bourgeois en France, en Allemagne, et en Suisse, 1750–1850*, ed. Étienne François. Paris: Éditions recherches sur les civilisations, 239–59.
- (1989). "Auf dem Weg zum Bildungsbürgertum: Die Lebensführungsart der jugendlichen Bildungsschicht 1750–1819," in *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*, Volume 3, ed. Reiner Lepsius. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 8–41.
- Harley, David Allen (2012). *The French Enlightenment and Its Others: The Mandarin, the Savage, and the Invention of the Human Sciences*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Hatfield, Gary (1990). *The Natural and the Normative: Theories of Spatial Perception from Kant to Helmholtz*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (1992). "Empirical, Rational, and Transcendental Psychology: Psychology as Science and as Philosophy," in *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*, ed. Paul Guyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 200–27.
- (1995). "Remaking the Science of Mind: Psychology as a Natural Science," in *Inventing Human Science*, ed. C. Fox, R. Porter, and R. Wokler. Berkeley: University of California Press, 184–231.
- (2009). "Perception as Unconscious Inference," in *Perception and Cognition: Essays in the Philosophy of Psychology*, ed. G. Hatfield. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 124–52.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1975). *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*, trans. H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1990). *The Natural and the Normative: Theories of Spatial Perception from Kant to Helmholtz*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (1992). "Empirical, Rational, and Transcendental Psychology: Psychology as Science and as Philosophy," in *Cambridge Companion to Kant*, ed. Paul Guyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 200–27.
- Heidegger, Martin (2010). *Being and Time*, trans. J. Stambaugh and D. Smith. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Heinz, Marion (2011). "Johann Georg Sulzer und die Anfänge der Dreivermögenslehre bei Kant," in *Johann Georg Sulzer (1720–1779)*:

- Aufklärung zwischen Christian Wolff und David Hume*, ed. F. Grunert and G. Stiening. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 83–100.
- Herrmann, Ulrich (1984). "Erziehung und Unterricht als Politicum: Kontroversen über erhoffte und befürchtete Wechselwirkungen von Politik und Pädagogik im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert in Deutschland," in *Aufklärung als Politisierung: Politisierung der Aufklärung*, ed. Hans Erich Bödeker and Ulrich Herrmann. Hamburg: Meiner, 53–71.
- Hinchman, Edward (2009). "Receptivity and the Will," *Nous* 43(3), 395–427.
- Hinske, Norbert (1961). "Kants Idee der Anthropologie," in *Die Frage nach dem Menschen: Aufriß einer philosophischen Anthropologie: Festschrift für Max Müller zum 60.* Freiburg and Munich: Karl Alber, 410–27.
- (1980). "Kants Leben als gelebtes Bürgertum. Vom galanten Magister zum zurückgezogenen Gelehrten," in *Kant als Herausforderung an die Gegenwart*, ed. N. Hinske. Freiburg and Munich: Albert, 17–30.
- (1983). "Wolffs Stellung in der deutschen Aufklärung," in *Christian Wolff 1679–1754*, ed. W. Schneiders. Hamburg: Meiner, 306–20.
- Hippel, Theodor von (1774). *Ueber die Ehe*. Berlin.
- Hobbes, Thomas (1660). *The Leviathan*, available at <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/phl302/texts/hobbes/leviathan-contents.html> (accessed March 2013).
- Holzhey, Helmut (1977). "Der Philosoph für die Welt: eine Chimäre der deutschen Aufklärung?," in *Esoterik und Exoterik der Philosophie: Beiträge zu Geschichte und Sinn philosophischer Selbstbestimmung*, ed. H. Holzhey and W. C. Zimmerli. Basel and Stuttgart: Schwabe, 117–38.
- Home, Henry, Lord Kames (1774a). *Sketches of the History of Man*, 4 vols. London: Strahan and Cadell.
- (1774b). *Versuche ueber die Geschichte des Menschen*, trans. A. E. Klausing. Leipzig: Junius.
- (2007). *Sketches on Human History*, edited James A. Harris, 3 vols. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Hull, Isabel (1996). *Sexuality, State, and Civil Society in Germany, 1700–1815*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Hundert, E.J. (2005). *The Enlightenment's Fable: Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huneman, Philippe, ed. (2007). *Understanding Purpose: Kant and the Philosophy of Biology*, Volume 8. North American Kant Society Studies in Philosophy. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Huneman, Philippe (2008). *Métaphysique et biologie: Kant et la constitution du concept d'organisme*. Paris: Éditions Kimé.
- Hutcheson, Francis (1971). *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections* (facsimile edition of the 1st edition, 1971), in *Collected Works*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- (2002). *Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections*, ed. Aaron Garrett. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.

- Ischreyt, Heinz, ed. (1995). *Königsberg und Riga*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Jacobs, Brian and Patrick Kain, eds. (2003a). *Essays in Kant's Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2003b). "Introduction," in *Essays on Kant's Anthropology*, ed. B. Jacobs and P. Kain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–14.
- Jauch, Ursula Pia (1988). *Immanuel Kant zur Geschlechterdifferenz: Aufklärerische Vorurteilkritik und bürgerliche Geschlechtsvormundschaft*. Vienna: Passagen.
- Kaag, John (2005). "Continuity and Inheritance: Kant's *Critique of Judgment* and the Work of C. S. Peirce," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 41(3), 515–40.
- Kant, Immanuel (2000). *Königsberger Kantiana*, ed. A. Kowalewski. Hamburg: Felix Meiner.
- (2004). *Vorlesung zur Moralphilosophie*, ed. Werner Stark. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- (2011). *Der einzig mögliche Beweisgrund zu einer Demonstration des Daseins Gottes*, ed. L. Kreimendahl and M. Oberhausen. Hamburg: Meiner.
- Käuser, Andreas (1990). "Anthropologie und Ästhetik im 18. Jahrhundert," *Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert* 14, 196–206.
- Keipert, Helmut (2006). "Ist Popes 'Essay on Man' bei Brockes wirklich nur aus dem Englischen übersetzt?," *Das achzehnte Jahrhundert*, 30(1), 79–88.
- Kemp, Martin (1990). *The Science of Art: Optical Themes in Western Art from Brunelleschi to Seurat*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kim, Soo Bae (1992). *Die Entstehung der Kantischen Anthropologie und ihre Beziehung zur empirischen Psychologie der Wolffschen Schule*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Kleingeld, Pauline (2001). "Nature or Providence? On the Theoretical and Moral Importance of Kant's Philosophy of History," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 75, 201–19.
- (2003). "Kant, History, and the Idea of Moral Development," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 16, 59–80.
- (2007). "Kant's Second Thoughts on Race," *Philosophical Quarterly* 57, 573–92.
- (2012). *Kant and Cosmopolitanism: The Philosophical Ideal of World Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kneller, Jane (2006). "Kant on Sex and Marriage," in *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Paul Guyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kohnen, Joseph, ed. (1994). *Königsberg: Beiträge zu einem besonderen Kapitel der deutschen Geistesgeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Kopitzsch, Frank (1983). "Die Aufklärung in Deutschland: Zu ihren Leistungen, Grenzen und Wirkungen," *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 23, 1–21.
- Kosenina, Alexander (1989). *Ernst Plattners Anthropologie und Philosophie*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Kuehn, Manfred (1987). *Scottish Common Sense in Germany, 1768–1800: A Contribution to the History of Critical Philosophy*. Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queens University Press.

- (2001). *Kant: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2006). "Introduction," in Immanuel Kant, *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, ed. R. B. Louden and M. Kuehn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, vii–xix.
- Larrimore, Mark (1999). "Sublime Waste: Kant on the Destiny of the 'Races,'" *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, Supplementary Volume 25, 99–125.
- La Vopa, Anthony (1988). *Grace, Merit and Talent: Poor Students, Clerical Careers, and Professional Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehmann, Gerhard (1969). "Kants Lebenskrise," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Interpretation der Philosophie Kants*, ed. Gerhard Lehmann. Berlin: De Gruyter, 411–21.
- Leibniz, G. W. (1981). *New Essays on Human Understanding*, trans. and ed. P. Remnant and J. Bennett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1985). *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, and the Origins of Evil*, ed. A. Farrer, trans. E. M. Huggard. La Salle: Open Court.
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim (1972). *Werke*. Volume 3, ed. K. S. Guthke. Munich: Hanser.
- (1773–81). *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur: Aus dem Schätzen der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel*. Braunschweig: Fürstl. Waysenhaus-Buchhandlung.
- Lestition, Steven (1985). "Kant's Philosophical Anthropology: Texts and Historical Contexts, Continuity and Change." Dissertation: University of Chicago.
- Lieberwirth, Rolf (1994). "Christian Thomasius (1655–1728)," in *Aufklärung und Erneuerung: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Universität Halle im ersten Jahrhundert ihres Bestehens (1694–1806)*, ed. G. Jerouschek and A. Sames. Hanau and Halle: Dausien, 29–46.
- Locke, John (1975). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. P. H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Louden, Robert (2000). *Kant's Impure Ethics: From Rational Beings to Human Beings*. London: Oxford University Press.
- (2007a). "Introduction," in Immanuel Kant, *Anthropology, History, and Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 227–30.
- (2007b). *The World We Want: How and Why the Ideals of the Enlightenment Still Elude Us*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (2011). *Kant's Human Being: Essays on His Theory of Human Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (2012). "'Not a Slow Reform, but a Swift Revolution': Kant and Basedow on the Need to Transform Education," in *Kant and Education: Interpretations and Commentary*, ed. Klas Roth and Chris W. Surprenant. New York: Routledge, 39–54.
- Lovejoy, Arthur O. (1910). "Kant and Evolution I," *Popular Science Monthly* 77, 538–53.
- (1911). "Kant and Evolution II," *Popular Science Monthly* 78, 36–51.
- Lyon, John and Philip R. Sloan (1981). *From Natural History to the History of Nature*. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press.

- McBay Merritt, Melissa (2011). "Kant on Enlightened Moral Pedagogy," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 49, 27–53.
- McCarty, Richard (1993). "Kantian Moral Motivation and the Feeling of Respect," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 31(3), 421–35.
- Makkreel, Rudolf (1990). *Imagination and Interpretation in Kant: The Hermeneutical Import of the Critique of Judgment*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- (1992). *Dilthey, Philosopher of the Human Studies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1994). *Imagination and Interpretation in Kant: The Hermeneutical Import of the Critique of Judgment*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- (2001a). "Kant on the Scientific Status of Psychology, Anthropology, and History," in *Kant and the Sciences*, ed. E. Watkins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 185–201.
- (2001b). "Kant's Anthropology and the Use and Misuse of the Imagination," in *Proceedings of the Ninth International Kant Congress*, ed. V. Gerhardt, R.-P. Horstmann, and R. Schumacher. Berlin: De Gruyter, 386–94.
- Mandeville, Bernard de (1714). *The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vices, Public Benefits*. London: J. Roberts.
- (1761). *Anti-Shafesbury, oder die Entlarvte Eitelkeit der Selbstliebe und Ruhmsucht: In philos. Gesprächen nach dem Englischen*, Frankfurt am Main: Garbe.
- Manganaro, Paolo (1983). *L'antropologia di Kant*. Naples: Guida.
- Marquard, Odo (1981). *Abschied vom Prinzipiellen*. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- (1982). "Zur Geschichte des philosophischen Begriffs 'Anthropologie' seit dem Ende des 18 Jahrhunderts," in *Schwierigkeiten mit der Geschichtsphilosophie: Aufsätze*, ed. O. Marquard. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 122–44.
- Marshall, Peter J. (1982). *The Great Map of Mankind: Perceptions of New Worlds in the Age of Enlightenment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Maurer, Michael (1987). *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Mauser, Wolfram (1989). "Geselligkeit: Zu Chance und Scheitern einer sozialetischen Utopie um 1750," in *Entwicklungsschwellen im 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. K. Eibl. Hamburg: Meiner, 5–36.
- Melton, James Van Horn (2001). *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mendelssohn, Moses (1996). "On the Question, What Is Enlightenment," in *What Is Enlightenment?*, trans. and ed. James Schmidt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 53–7.
- Mensch, Jennifer (2013). *Kant's Organicism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mikkola, Mari (2011). "Kant on Moral Agency and Women's Nature," *Kantian Review* 16(1), 89–111.
- Moravia, Sergio (1973). *Beobachtende Vernunft: Philosophie und Anthropologie in der Aufklärung*. Munich: Hanser.

- (1980). "The Enlightenment and the Sciences of Man," *History of Science* 18, 247–68.
- Morrison, Iain (2005). "On Kantian Maxims: A Reconciliation of the Incorporation Thesis and Weakness of the Will," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 22, 73–89.
- Mosser, Kurt (1999). "Kant and Feminism," *Kant-Studien* 90(3), 322–53.
- Müller, Rainer (1975). "Sozialstatus und Studienchancen im Zeitalter der Aufklärung," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 95, 120–41.
- Munzel, G. Felicitas (1999). *Kant's Conception of Moral Character: The "Critical" Link of Morality, Anthropology, and Reflective Judgment*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- (2012). *Kant's Conception of Pedagogy: Toward Education for Freedom*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- (forthcoming). "What Does His Religion Contribute to Kant's Conception of Practical Reason?," in *Kant's Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason: A Critical Guide*, ed. G. Michalson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muthu, Sankar (2003). *Enlightenment against Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Nowicki, Hans-Peter (2003). *Der wohltemperierte Mensch: Aufklärungsanthropologien im Widerstreit*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Oberhausen, Michael and Riccardo Pozzo, eds. (1999). *Vorlesungsverzeichnisse der Universität Königsberg (1720–1804): Mit einer Einleitung und Registern herausgegeben*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.
- O'Neill, Onora (1989). *Constructions of Reason: Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Park, Peter K. J. (2013). *Africa, Asia, and the History of Philosophy: Racism and the Formation of the Philosophical Canon, 1780–1930*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Pastore, Nicholas (1971). *Selective History of Theories of Visual Perception*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pfotenauer, Helmut (1987). *Literarische Anthropologie*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Platner, Ernst (1772). *Anthropologie für Ärzte und Weltweise*. Leipzig: Dyck. Reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 2000.
- Porterfield, William (1759). *A Treatise on the Eye: The Manner and Phenomena of Vision*, 2 vols. Edinburgh: Balfour.
- Potesta, Andrea (2004). *La pragmatica di Kant: Saperi al confine tra antropologia e criticismo*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Priestley, Joseph (1776). *Geschichte und gegenwärtiger Zustand der Optik, vorzüglich in Absicht auf den physikalischen Theil dieser Wissenschaft*, trans. G. S. Klügel. Leipzig: Junius.
- Raynal, G.T. (1770). *Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes*, 6 vols. Amsterdam.
- Redekop, Benjamin (2000). *Enlightenment and Community: Lessing, Abbt, Herder, and the Quest for a German Public*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

- Reid, Thomas (1785). *An Inquiry into the Human Mind*, 4th ed. Edinburgh: Bell and Creech.
- Reimarus, Hermann (1982). *Allgemeine Betrachtungen über die Triebe der Thiere, hauptsächlich über ihre Kunsttriebe*, ed. J. von Kempster. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ritzel, Wolfgang (1985). *Immanuel Kant: Eine Biographie*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Rorty, Amélie Oksenberg and James Schmidt, eds. (2009). *Kant's Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, Helen E. and Cornelis Plug (1998). "The History of Size Constancy and Size Illusions," in *Perceptual Constancy: Why Things Look as They Do*, ed. V. Walsh and J. Kulikowski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 499–528.
- (2002). *The Mystery of the Moon Illusion: Exploring Size Perception*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (1756). *Abhandlung von dem Ursprunge der Ungleichheit unter den Menschen*. Berlin: Voss.
- (1964). *Oeuvres Completes*, Volume 3. Paris: Gallimard.
- (1969). *Émile*, in *Oeuvres complètes de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, Volume 4. Paris: Gallimard.
- (1990). *Collected Writings of Rousseau*, 6 vols., ed. R. D. Masters and C. Kelly, trans. J. R. Bush, R. D. Masters, C. Kelly, and T. Marshall. Hanover and London: University Press of New England.
- (1997). *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, ed. V. Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saji, Motohide (2009). "On the Division between Reason and Unreason in Kant," *Human Studies* 32(2), 201–23.
- Scheible, Heinz (1997). *Melanchthon: Eine Biographie*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Schings, Hans-Jürgen, ed. (1994). *Der ganze Mensch: Anthropologie und Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Schlapp, Otto (1901). *Kants Lehre vom Genie und die Entstehung der "Kritik der Urteilskraft"*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich (1799). "Review of Kant's Anthropology," *Athenäum* 2, 300–6. Reprinted in *Schriften aus der Berliner Zeit 1796–1799*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1984, 365–9.
- (1998). "Review of Kant's Anthropology," in *Schleiermacher on the Workings of the Knowing Mind: New Translations, Resources, and Understandings*, trans. R. D. Richardson. Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Schmidt, Claudia (2004). "Kant on the Disorders and Talents of Cognition in the Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View," *Eighteenth-Century Thought* 2, 299–329.
- (2008). "Kant's Transcendental and Empirical Psychology of Cognition," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 39, 462–72.

- (1983). "Zwischen Welt und Weisheit: Zur Verweltlichung der Philosophie in der frühen Moderne," *Studia Leibnitiana* 15(1), 2–18.
- (1985). "Der Philosophiebegriff des philosophischen Zeitalters: Wandlungen im Selbstverständnis der Philosophie von Leibniz bis Kant," in *Wissenschaft im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*, ed. R. Vierhaus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 58–92.
- (1986). "Akademische Weltweisheit: Die deutsche Philosophie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung," in *Aufklärungen: Frankreich und Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. G. Sauder and J. Schlobach. Heidelberg, Volume 1, 25–44.
- Schneiders, Werner (1989). "Thomasius politicus: Einige Bemerkungen über Staatskunst und Privatpolitik in der aufklärerischen Klugheitslehre," in *Zentren der Aufklärung*, Volume 1: *Halle Aufklärung und Pietismus*, ed. N. Hinske. Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 91–110.
- Schöndörffer, Otto (1924). "Der elegante Magister," *Reichs Philosophischer Almanach auf das Jahr 1924: Immanuel Kant zum Gedächtnis*. Darmstadt, 65–86.
- Schott, Robin May, ed. (1997). *Feminist Interpretations of Immanuel Kant*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schröder, Hannelore (1999). "Kant's Patriarchal Order," in *Feminist Interpretations of Immanuel Kant*, ed. R. Schott. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 275–96.
- Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of (1964 [1711]). *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, ed. John M. Robertson. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Shell, Susan M. (1996). *The Embodiment of Reason: Kant on Spirit, Generation, and Community*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- (2003). "Kant's 'True Economy of Human Nature': Rousseau, Count Verri, and the Problem of Happiness," in *Essays on Kant's Anthropology*, ed. B. Jacobs and P. Kain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 194–229.
- (2009). *Kant and the Limits of Autonomy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shell, Susan M. and Richard L. Velkley, eds. (2012). *Kant's Observations and Remarks: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sloan, Philip R. (2006). "Kant on the History of Nature: The Ambiguous Heritage of the Critical Philosophy for Natural History," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 37, 637–48.
- Smith, Adam (1979). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, ed. R. H. Campbell and A. S. Skinner, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sorenson, Kelley (2002). "Kant's Taxonomy of the Emotions," *Kantian Review* 6, 109–28.
- Stark, Werner (1995). "Kant als akademischer Lehrer," in *Königsberg und Riga*, ed. H. Ischreyt. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 51–68.
- (April 1997). "Kant's *Lectures on Anthropology*." Paper presented at the Central Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association, Pittsburgh.

- (2003). "Historical Notes and Interpretive Questions about Kant's Lectures on Anthropology," in *Essays on Kant's Anthropology*, ed. B. Jacobs and P. Kain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 15–37.
- (2010). "Was wußte Kant über Asien? Hinweise und Überlegungen zu Kants Interesse an Fragen der Geographie," in *Materialen der 10. Internationalen Kant Konferenz: Klassische Vernunft und Herausforderungen der modernen Zivilisation, 22–24 April 2009, Kaliningrad*, Volume 1, ed. V. I. Bryushinkin. Kaliningrad: Russian State Kant University, Institute for Kant Studies, 101–21.
- (2011). "Immanuel Kant's Lectures on Physical Geography: A Brief Outline of Its Origin, Transmission and Development: 1754–1804," in *Reading Kant's Geography*, ed. Stuart Elden and Eduardo Mendieta. Albany: State University of New York Press, 69–85.
- (2012). "Immanuel Kant 'Ueber Pädagogik': Eine Vorlesung wie jede andere?," *Jahrbuch für Historische Bildungsforschung, Band 18. Emotionen*, 147–68.
- (2014). "Rousseau und Kant," in *250 Jahre Emile, ou de l'éducation: Bildungshistorische Reflexionen zu Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (conference at the Bibliothek für Bildungsgeschichtliche Forschung of the DIPF. 25–6 May 2012, Berlin), in press.
- Stavenhagen, Kurt (1949). *Kant und Königsberg*. Göttingen: Deuerlich.
- Strawson, Peter (1959). *Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*. London: Methuen.
- Sturm, Thomas (2009). *Kant und die Wissenschaften vom Menschen*. Paderborn: Mentis.
- (2011). "Freedom and the Human Sciences: Hume's Science of Man versus Kant's Pragmatic Anthropology," *Kant Yearbook* 3, 23–42.
- Thomasius, Christian (1687). *Discours, Welcher Gestalt man denen Frantzosen in gemeinem Leben und Wandel nachahmen solle?* Published 1721.
- Tonelli, Giorgio (1975). "Conditions in Königsberg and the Making of Kant's Philosophy," in *Bewußtsein: Gerhard Funke zu eigen*, ed. A. Bucher, H. Drüe, and T. Seebohm. Bonn: Bouvier, 126–44.
- Turner, R. Steven (1974). "University Reformers and Professional Scholarship in Germany, 1760–1806," in *The University in Society, Volume 2: Europe, Scotland, and the United States from the 16th to the 20th Century*, ed. L. Stone. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 495–531.
- (1980). "The *Bildungsbürgertum* and the Learned Professions in Prussia, 1770–1830: The Origins of a Class," *Histoire sociale/Social History* 13, 108–35.
- Van de Pitte, Frederick (1971). *Kant as Philosophical Anthropologist*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Velkley, Richard L. (1989). *Freedom and the End of Reason: On the Moral Foundation of Kant's Critical Philosophy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Vidal, Fernando (2011). *The Sciences of the Soul: The Early Modern Origins of Psychology*, trans. Saskia Brown. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Vorländer, Karl [1924] (1977). *Immanuel Kant: Der Mann und der Werk*. Hamburg: Meiner.

- Vyverberg, Henry (1958). *Historical Pessimism in the French Enlightenment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Warda, Arthur (1922). *Immanuel Kants Bücher*. Berlin: Martin Breslauer.
- Waschkies, Hans-Joachim (1987). *Physik und Physikotheologie des jungen Kant: Die Vorgeschichte seiner Allgemeinen Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels*. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner.
- Watkins, Eric (2013). *The Divine Order, The Human Order, and the Order of Nature: Historical Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Watkins, Eric and Marcus Willaschek (forthcoming). "Kant's Account of Cognition," *Journal of the History of Philosophy*.
- Waxman, Wayne (1991). *Kant's Model of the Mind: A New Interpretation of Transcendental Idealism*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, Claude (1999). "'Von der Freyheit zu philosophiren': Christian Wolffs Forderung einer libertas philosophandi als Bedingung und als Methode der Philosophie," in *Formen der Aufklärung und ihrer Rezeption/Expressions des Lumières et de leur réception: Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Ulrich Ricken*, ed. R. Back, R. Desné, and G. Haßler. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 17–34.
- Weber, Max (1958). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Weis, Norbert (1993). *Königsberg: Immanuel Kant und seine Stadt*. Braunschweig: Westermann.
- Wellman, Chad (2010). *Becoming Human: Romantic Anthropology and the Embodiment of Freedom*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Westlinning, Margot (1995). "Der junge Herder in Königsberg," in *Königsberg und Riga*, ed. H. Ischreyt. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 69–86.
- Whiten, A. et al. (1999). "Cultures in Chimpanzees," *Nature* 399, 682–5.
- Williams, Bernard (1981). *Moral Luck*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, David, ed. (1999). *The Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Catherine (1997). "Between Medicina Mentis and Medical Materialism," in *Logic and the Workings of the Mind*, ed. P. A. Easton. Atascadero, CA: Ridgeview, 251–68.
- (1998). "Savagery and the Supersensible: Kant's Moral Universalism in Historical Context," *History of European Ideas* 24, 315–30.
- (2005). "Kant and the Speculative Sciences of Origins," in *The Problem of Animal Generation in the 17th and 18th Centuries*, ed. J. E. H. Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 375–401.
- (2011). "Nature, War, and History: Some Remarks on Leibniz's Theodicy from an Eighteenth-Century Perspective," in *Lectures et interprétations des essais de theodicée de G. W. Leibniz*, ed. P. Rateau. Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 307–16.
- Wilson, E. O. (1978). *On Human Nature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, Holly L. 1991. "A Gap in American Kant Scholarship: Pragmatic Anthropology as the Application of Kantian Moral Philosophy," in *Proceedings of the Sixth International Kant Congress*, ed. G. Funke. Bonn: Bouvier, 403–19.

- (2006). *Pragmatic Anthropology: Its Origins, Meaning, and Critical Significance*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wood, Allen W. (1991). "Unsocial sociability: The Anthropological Basis for Kant's Ethics," *Philosophical Topics* 19, 325–51.
- (1999). *Kant's Ethical Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2000). "Kant vs. Eudaimonism," in *Kant's Legacy: Essays Dedicated to Lewis White Beck*, ed. P. Cicovacki. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- (2002). *Unsettling Obligations: Essays on Reason, Reality and the Ethics of Belief*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- (2003). "Kant and the Problem of Human Nature," in *Essays on Kant's Anthropology*, ed. B. Jacobs and P. Kain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 38–59.
- (2008). *Kantian Ethics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (2009). "Fourth Proposition: Unsociable Sociability," in *Kant's Idea for a Universal History: A Critical Guide*, ed. Amélie Rorty and James Schmidt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 112–28.
- (2013). "General Introduction," in Immanuel Kant, *Lectures on Anthropology*, ed. Allen Wood and Robert Loudon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–10.
- (2014). "The Evil in Human Nature," in *Kant's Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason: A Critical Guide*, ed. G. Michalson. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Yovel, Yirmiyahu (1989). *Kant and the Philosophy of History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zammito, John (2002). *Kant, Herder and the Birth of Anthropology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- (2006). "Kant's Early Views of Epigenesis," in *The Problem of Animal Generation in Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. J. E. H. Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 317–54.
- Zimmerli, Walther (1978). "Arbeitssteilige Philosophie? Gedanken zur Teil-Rehabilitierung der Populärphilosophie," in *Wozu Philosophie? Stellungnahmen eines Arbeitskreises*, ed. H. Lübke. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 181–212.
- (1981). "'Schulfuchsische' und 'handgreifliche' Rationalität – oder: Stehen dunkler Tiefsinn und Common Sense im Widerspruch?" in *Wandel des Vernunftbegriffs*, ed. H. Poser. Freiburg and Munich: Albers, 137–76.
- Zöllner, Gunter (1988). "Kant and the Generation of Metaphysical Knowledge," in *Kant: Analysen-Probleme-Kritik*, ed. H. Oberer and G. Seele. Würzburg: Königshausen and Neumann, 71–90.
- (2011). "Kant's Political Anthropology," *Kant Yearbook* 3, 131–59.
- Zuckert, Rachel (2007). *Kant on Beauty and Biology: An Interpretation of the Critique of Judgment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Index

- Abbé de St. Pierre, 198, 209, 212, 213, 227
 Abegg, Johann Friedrich, 191
 abstraction, 23, 46–7, 205
 Académie royale des sciences et belles lettres, 15
 adaptationism, 200
 Addison, Joseph, 13
 Adickes, Erich, 15
 adultery, 197
 affects, 24, 90, 93, 94–8, 100–6, 109–13, 139–42, 143, 149, 162
 affinity, 33, 158
 African (people), 204, 205, 244
 agency, 93, 104, 106, 111, 133, 134, 135, 140, 141
 agriculture, 146, 170, 200
 Allais, Lucy, 66
 Allison, Henry, 104, 117
 ambition, 96, 147–8
 Americans (people), 81, 204, 205
 angels, 16, 226
 anger, 24, 95, 96, 97, 98, 102, 105–6, 108, 111, 140, 198
 animalism, 192–5, 207
 apperception, 26, 27
 aptitudes, 78, 134, 165, 175, 177, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 233
 Arens, Katherine, 93
 Asian (people), 204, 205, 223
 association, 33, 51, 70, 73, 75, 158
 attention, 26, 28, 46–7, 61, 65, 88, 113, 157
 Augustine, St, 198
 autonomy, 166, 206, 231
 avarice, 98, 139, 145, 148

 Barnard, Alan, 2
 Baron, Marcia, 104
 Basedow, Johann Bernhard, 151, 188, 212, 213
 Baumgarten, Alexander, 10, 11–12, 13, 21, 43, 45, 46, 72, 73, 95, 139, 155, 165
 Beck, Lewis White, 248
 benevolence, 28, 150, 199, 208
 Bergk, Johann Adam, 39, 127

 Berkeley, George, 51, 54
 Bernasconi, Robert, 244
Bestimmung, 151, 153, 159, 164, 175, 177, 183, 217–20, 222–3, 224, 225, 226, 227–8, 246
 Bible, 191
 biography, 48
 birds, 219
 blindness, 52, 66, 69
 Blumenbach, Johann Friedrich, 244, 245
 Bödeker, Hans Erich, 236
 Boileau-Despréaux, Nicolas, 13
 Borges, Maria, 102, 104–5, 106
 Brandt, Reinhard, 2, 4, 15, 127, 206, 214, 217, 228, 230, 232, 235, 240, 242, 246, 247, 248
 Buffon, George-Louis Leclerc, Comte de, 192–5, 196, 197, 198, 199, 207, 244
 Burke, Edmund, 13

 Camper, Peter, 192, 193
 Carhart, Michael, 247
 Cassirer, Ernst, 231
 categorical imperative, 116–18, 144, 240
 causation, 54, 70
 character (moral), 32–3, 35, 187–8, 189, 232
 chastity, 197
 children, 115, 129–30, 188, 203, 208
 Chinese (people), 205
 Ciafardone, Raffaele, 217, 236
 civil society, 80, 169, 193, 198, 200, 202–3, 204
 Clewis, Robert, 104, 112, 166
 climate, 79, 153, 212, 225
 Cohen, Alix, 5, 7, 166, 244
 Comenius, Johann Amos, 189
 compassion, 24
 competitiveness, 139
 Condorcet, Jean-Antoine-Nicolas de Caritat, 195, 206
 co-operation, 25
 cosmopolitanism, 25, 213, 228, 230, 242
 courage, 141–2, 162
 cowardliness, 201, 217

- creation, 78, 192
critical philosophy, 173, 178, 180, 185, 188, 192
culture, 48, 103, 145, 175, 178, 191–210, 215,
219–20, 222–3, 225–6, 236, 241–2
- David-Ménard, Monique, 7
Dean, Richard, 118
dementia, 71
desire, 38, 89, 94–5, 96, 97, 98–101, 102–4,
106–7, 110–11, 118, 121, 133–50, 155, 161–4,
177, 197, 225, 245
developmental variation, 77, 222
De Witt, Janelle, 142
dexterity, 199, 218
Diamond, Jared, 205
Diderot, Denis, 209
Dilthey, Wilhelm, 22
disgust, 161, 163
diversity, 72, 73, 77, 78, 79, 80–1, 84, 217
domination, 98, 123, 124, 125, 146, 147, 205, 207
Dougherty, Frank, 244
duty, 85, 109, 111, 117, 135, 139, 142, 150, 177, 189,
199, 208, 223
Dyck, Corey W., 153
dynamics, 68
- education, 17, 26–7, 78, 91, 129, 131–2, 159, 167,
169, 170, 172–90, 196, 202, 206, 212, 213,
222, 224, 231, 232–5, 236–7, 238
egoism, 26, 46, 155
embarrassment, 20, 26, 48
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 148, 149
emotions, 22, 93, 96, 97, 98, 101, 104, 106, 112,
142
empirical psychology, 12, 20–1, 38, 40, 42–3,
44–5, 46–7, 49, 53, 98–100, 102, 107, 127,
128, 130, 139, 153, 154–64, 192, 246
empiricism, 235, 242
English (people), 74, 82, 83, 243
enthusiasm, 24, 104, 112, 115, 118, 131–2, 140, 149,
152, 158–9
Epicurus, 25, 192
equanimity, 25, 33, 161, 171
ethology, 220, 221
extramission theory, 54
Eze, Emmanuel, 2, 7, 81, 244
- Fall (of Adam and Eve), 199, 201, 203
fanaticism, 24, 71
fear, 29, 98, 102, 138, 140, 141, 142, 148, 157, 198
Fellows, Otis, 196, 197
Ferrari, Jean, 3
Fielding, Henry, 13
Firla, Monika, 3
Fischer, Joachim, 248
- folly, 71
foolishness, 71
foresight, 33, 34, 169, 174
Foucault, Michel, 3
freedom, 104–5, 114–32, 206–7, 208
French (people), 79, 82, 83, 241, 242, 243
fright, 96, 102
frugality, 120, 199
Fusil, C. A., 209
- gallantry, 28, 197
Gause, Fritz, 230
Gemüth, 31, 155–8, 160, 161, 162–3, 165, 169
gender, 2, 7, 12, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84
genius, 76, 84, 239
geography, 40, 59, 152, 154, 212, 233
George, Rolf, 231
Gerard, Alexander, 13
German (people), 74, 79, 82, 239, 242
Gesinnung, 186
Girtanner, Christoph, 244
God, 13, 14, 16, 55, 67, 168, 169, 188, 192, 225, 226
government, 184, 185, 205, 245, 246
greed, 98, 147–8
Greek (people), 205
Greene, John C., 193
Gregor, Mary, 4
Gulyga, Arsenji, 231
- Haller, Albrecht, 16
happiness, 4, 6, 102, 103, 108–9, 110, 113, 115, 118,
121–2, 123–5, 126–7, 128, 129–30, 135, 137–8,
144, 149, 156, 158, 160–1, 162, 167, 176, 186,
187, 198, 201–2, 206, 209, 222–3, 236
Harley, David Allen, 243
harmony, 31, 114, 166
health, 20, 27, 120, 126, 138, 140, 160, 188, 201
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 148, 149
Heidegger, Martin, 35
Heinz, Marion, 11
Helvétius, Claude Adrien, 13
Herder, Johann Gottfried von, 208, 242
Herrmann, Ulrich, 236
Herz, Marcus, 41
Hinchman, Edward, 106
Hindus (people), 81, 205
Hinske, Norbert, 2, 231, 236
Hippel, Theodor von, 206
history (discipline), 48, 154, 165, 203–4
Hobbes, Thomas, 11, 109, 198, 207, 208
Holzhey, Helmut, 236
Home, Henry (Lord Kames), 13, 193, 195, 202,
206
Sketches on Human History, 196
honour, 201, 202, 205

- Hull, Isabel, 241
humanity (idea of), 117
 formula of, 129
Hume, David, 70, 241, 243, 244
 Dialogues concerning Natural Religion, 191
Huneman, Phillippe, 156, 214
hunting, 145, 200
Hutcheson, Frances, 95, 139, 198
 Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections, 96, 139

idiocy, 71
ignorance, 74, 159
illusion, 27–8, 49, 53–6, 67, 74, 90
imagination (productive/reproductive), 69–70
inclination
 natural, 124, 125, 126, 127, 130–2, 136
 reasonable, 124
incorporation thesis, 104–5
Indian (people), 81, 204–5, 216
industry, 201, 202
infanticide, 197
insanity/mental illness, 47, 71, 181
intelligence, 55, 56, 156–7
intersubjectivity, 63, 75

Jachmann, Reinhold Bernhard, 1
Jauch, Ursula Pia, 241
Joucourt, Louis de, 198
justice, 132, 164, 166, 185, 201, 225, 227

Kaag, John, 2
Kant, Immanuel
 Announcement of the Programme for his Lectures for the Winter Semester 1765–6, 178, 233
 An Answer to the Question: What Is Enlightenment?, 177, 184
 Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View, 2, 12, 18, 78, 94, 123, 130, 133, 221, 248
 The Conflict of the Faculties, 220
 Conjectural Beginning of Human History, 175
 Critique of Practical Reason, 93, 128, 176–7, 184, 186
 Critique of Pure Reason, 6, 16, 19, 26, 27, 42, 57–8, 127, 181, 182–3, 186
 Critique of the Power of Judgment, 11, 32, 35, 36
 Dreams of a Spirit Seer, 11
 The End of All Things, 159
 Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals, 6, 93, 114, 116–17, 118, 129, 137, 138, 141, 147, 155, 160, 162, 166, 223
 Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim, 187, 214, 224, 245

Inquiry concerning the Distinctness of the Principles of Natural Theology and Morality, 114
Lectures on Ethics, 105, 114, 115, 116, 117, 142, 151
Lectures on Logic, 1, 46
Lectures on Metaphysics, 43, 46, 49
Lectures on Natural Right, 114, 116
Lectures on Pedagogy, 115, 118, 215–16, 218
Lectures on Physical Geography, 12, 14, 212
Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science, 68
Metaphysics of Morals, 93, 94, 109, 111, 117, 122, 188, 235
Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime, 2, 10, 11, 114, 122, 130, 237
Of the Different Races of Human Beings, 2, 215
On the Use of Teleological Principles in Philosophy, 2, 215
The Only Possible Argument in Support of a Demonstration of the Existence of God, 15
Opus postumum, 130
Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics, 43, 63, 66
Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason, 109–10, 125, 135–6, 177, 188
Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Project, 187, 212
Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens, 14–15

Käuser, Andreas, 230
Keipert, Helmut, 13
Kim, Soo Bae, 3
Kleingeld, Pauline, 7, 213, 224, 230, 242
Königsberg Albertina, 12
Kopitzsch, Frank, 235
Kuehn, Manfred, 1, 2, 5, 40, 231, 242

labour, 201
La Rochefoucauld, François, Duc de, 13, 198
Larrimore, Mark, 2, 7, 81, 244
Lavater, Johann Kaspar, 239
La Vopa, Anthony, 231
laziness, 74, 80, 201, 202, 217
Le Bouyer de Fontenelle, Bernard, 13
Lehmann, Gerhard, 116, 231
Leiberwirth, Rolf, 236
Leibniz, Gottfried, 15, 73, 193, 204, 226
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 13, 191
 Pope ein Metaphysiker, 15
Lestition, Steven, 1, 247
libertinism, 196
Linnaeus, Carl, 84, 192, 193, 199, 244
Locke, John, 11, 43, 131, 193, 207
logic, 12, 26, 48

- Louden, Robert, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 79, 125, 127, 240, 244
 love, 28, 98, 121, 141, 142, 147, 150, 163, 197, 208
 Lovejoy, Arthur O., 193
 Lucretius, 191, 196
- McBay Merritt, Melissa, 91
 McCarty, Richard, 142
 magnitude, 72
 Makkreel, Rudolf, 7
 Mandeville, Bernard de, 198, 200
 Manganoro, Paolo, 3
 Marquard, Odo, 200, 230
 Marshall, Peter J., 243
 masturbation, 197
 maturity, 37, 166, 167, 168, 177, 214, 218, 245
 Maupertuis, Pierre Louis Moreau de
 Système de la nature, 16
 Maurer, Michael, 242
 Mauser, Wolfram, 236
 mechanics, 198
 melancholy, 47
 Melton, James Van Horn, 235
 memory, 33–4, 41, 44, 48, 86–7, 88
 mendacity, 139
 Mendelssohn, Moses, 155, 236
 Mensch, Jennifer, 156, 158
 Mikkola, Mari, 7
 Milton, John, 13
 misanthropy, 159, 169, 200
 misery, 137, 156, 167, 196, 201
 misogyny, 159, 169
 misogyny, 152, 159, 169, 176, 181
 monogamy, 195
 Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de, 13
 moral law, 107, 110, 116–17, 128, 142, 148, 187, 189, 201
 Moravia, Sergio, 230, 236
 Morrisson, Iain, 108
 Moscati, Peter, 153, 175, 194, 244, 245
 Munzel, G. Felicitas, 125, 153, 156, 240, 241
- nationality, 79, 81
 natural capacities, 40, 85
 natural knowledge, 42, 45, 154
 natural man, 11, 198, 208
 nobility, 63, 64
 novelty, 73
 Nowicki, Hans-Peter, 230
- old age, 166, 206
 O'Neill, Onora, 91
- pacifism, 198, 209
 paradoxes, 74, 144, 196, 210
- Park, Peter K. J., 231
 passions, 17, 94–8, 106–13, 139–40, 143–50, 161, 162, 171, 189, 198, 201, 207
 passivity, 19, 49, 60, 74, 144
 Pastore, Nicholas, 52
 pedantry, 152, 154, 232, 234
 personality, 147, 156, 157, 169, 176, 177
 pessimism, 191, 195
 Pfothner, Helmut, 247
 philosophy of right, 126
 physics, 12, 42–3, 44, 47, 174, 192, 204
 Platner, Ernst, 10, 41, 152, 220, 234
 pleasure, 25, 29, 30, 31–2, 49, 60, 61, 67, 80, 86, 94, 99–100, 101, 121, 133, 134–5, 136–7, 142, 152, 155, 156, 159–61, 162–3, 164, 171
 pluralism, 46
 Poles (people), 243
 politeness, 28
 political philosophy, 245
 polygamy, 195
 Pope, Alexander, 13, 14, 15–16
 Essay on Man, 13, 15
 Porterfield, William, 51
 possession, 23
 Potesta, Andrea, 3
 power of choice (*Willkür/Willkühr*), 120, 125, 126, 177
 practical philosophy, 25, 40, 172
 pragmatic knowledge, 45, 87–8, 174
 Priestley, Joseph, 52, 54
 primary/secondary quality distinction, 66
 prostitution, 197
 Providence, 149, 192, 195, 196, 200, 203, 204, 205, 209, 227
 prudence, 4, 40, 45, 47, 59, 87, 113, 134, 140, 143, 149, 152, 154, 174–5
 puberty, 196
 pugnacity, 199, 200, 225
- race, 2, 7, 78–9, 81, 153, 205, 212, 223–4, 238, 240, 243–4
 radical evil, 113, 135–6, 148
 Raynal, Guillaume Thomas François, 195, 209
 reflexive awareness, 22
 Reid, Thomas, 51
 Reimarus, Hermann Samuel, 191, 245
 reputation, 120, 138, 162, 203
 Ritzel, Wolfgang, 231, 232
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 2, 10, 16, 17, 148, 155, 159, 169, 175, 185, 194, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201, 202, 207, 208, 209, 241, 244, 245
 Discourse on the Origins of Inequality, 10–11, 137, 170, 193, 244

- Émile*, 10, 167–8, 188
Of the Social Contract, or Principles of Political Right, 202
 Russians (people), 243
- satisfaction, 97, 119, 120–2, 123, 124, 126–7, 136–7, 138, 144
 Scheible, Heinz, 12
 Schlapp, Otto, 14
 Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 2, 247
 Schmidt, Claudia, 59, 66, 77, 88, 226
 Schneiders, Werner, 231, 236
 Schöndörffer, Otto, 231
 Schott, Robin, 7
 Schröder, Hannelore, 241
 secretiveness, 201
 secularisation, 191–2, 209
 self-consciousness, 11, 19, 22, 25, 26–7, 77, 153, 155, 156
 self-determination, 33, 134–5, 245
 self-governance, 98, 100, 112
 self-love, 108, 110, 132, 135
 self-observation, 18, 20, 26, 47–9
 self-prescription, 35
 self-preservation, 181, 199
sensus communis, 36, 91
 servility, 139
 Seven Years War, 242
 Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper Lord, 13, 149, 198
An Inquiry Concerning Virtue or Merit, 149
 Shakespeare, William, 13
 shame, 102, 140
 Shell, Susan, 3, 7, 153
 sight, 28, 52, 62–6, 67
 silliness, 71
 sin, original. *See* Fall (of Adam and Eve)
 smell, 22, 28, 30, 49–50, 61, 63
 Smith, Adam, 199, 224
 Sorenson, Kelley, 104, 112
 speech, 30, 175–6, 178, 193
 spirit (*Geist*), 21, 23, 155–7, 170, 194
 spontaneity, 27, 155, 170, 206
 Stanhope, Philipp Dormer (Earl of Chesterfield), 13
 Stark, Werner, 1, 4, 38, 173, 214, 240, 241
 state of nature, 11, 195, 197, 198, 201–2, 245
 Stavenhagen, Kurt, 230
 Sterne, Laurence, 13
 Stoicism, 23–5, 136
 Strawson, Peter Frederick, 64, 127
 Sturm, Thomas, 4, 41, 125, 214, 220, 238, 240, 246
 sublime, 11, 29, 31–2, 33
 suicide, 142
- summum bonum*, 115
 superiority, 128, 146, 147, 148
 Swift, Jonathan, 13
 systematicity, 74, 235
- talents, 76–85, 89, 120, 167, 185, 200–1, 205, 216, 222, 225, 227
 taxonomy, 192
 temperaments, 12, 79–80, 82, 85–7, 93, 103, 237–8, 239
 theodicy, 204, 226
 Thomasius, Christian, 236, 241
 Tonelli, Giorgio, 230
 touch, 22, 28, 30, 38, 49, 50, 51, 52–3, 61, 62, 63, 67–8, 69
 transcendental
 deduction, 69
 idealism, 4, 171
 truth, 72, 73, 74, 89, 91
 Turks (people), 243
 Turner, R. Steven, 236
 tyranny, 147–8
 Tyson, Edward, 193
- unsociable sociability, 79, 139, 148, 224, 225–6
 utilitarianism, 6, 223
- vainglory, 98
 Van de Pitte, Frederick, 3
 vegetarianism, 194, 199
 Velkley, Richard L., 153
 vengeance, 108–9, 132, 146
 Verri, Pietro
Discourse on Pleasure and Pain, 171
 vice, 89, 139, 163, 167, 175, 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 245
 Vidal, Fernando, 40
 virility, 196
 virtue, 6, 15, 94, 101, 109, 111–13, 123–4, 140, 141, 143, 159, 163, 167, 182, 186, 196, 198, 200–2, 203, 223
 vitalism, 4, 8, 28–32, 61, 101, 156, 160, 163
 Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de, 13, 195, 198
 Vorländer, Karl, 232
 Vyverberg, Henry, 195
- Waal, Frans de, 229
 Warda, Arthur, 16
 warfare, 146, 195, 196, 198
 Waschkie, Hans-Joachim, 15
 Watkins, Eric, 7, 58
 Waxman, Wayne, 158
 wealth, 120, 126, 138, 147, 162, 195
 Weber, Max, 222
 weeping, 140

- Weis, Norbert, 230
 Wellman, Chad, 247
 Westlinning, Margot, 242
 Will (*Wille*), 124, 125, 177
 Williams, Bernard, 150
 Wilson, Catherine, 1, 7, 77
 Wilson, Edward Osborne, 228–9
 Wilson, Holly L., 3, 40, 125, 215
 wisdom, 5, 25, 33, 36, 40, 56, 82, 88, 152, 166, 178, 183, 194, 231–2, 234, 236, 239, 240, 246
 wit, 70–1, 88, 141
 Wolff, Christian, 236
 women, 147, 166, 169, 195, 197, 205–6, 238, 241–2
 Wood, Allen, 1, 4, 42, 79, 91, 209, 240
 world history (*Welthistorie*), 164–9
 xenophobia, 199
 Young, Edward, 13
 youth, 90, 166, 196, 232, 234
 Zammito, John, 1, 2, 3, 7, 41, 78, 79, 87, 156, 208
 Zimmerli, Walther, 236
 Zöller, Gunter, 158, 215, 226

CAMBRIDGE CRITICAL GUIDES

Nietzsche's *On the Genealogy of Morality*

EDITED BY SIMON MAY

Kant's *Observations and Remarks*

EDITED BY RICHARD VELKLEY AND SUSAN SHELL

Augustine's *City of God*

EDITED BY JAMES WETZEL

Descartes' *Meditations*

EDITED BY KAREN DETLEFSEN

Kant's *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*

EDITED BY GORDON MICHALSON

Kant's *Lectures on Anthropology*

EDITED BY ALIX COHEN